THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In *Time and Tide* of 17th August, C. S. Lewis has an interesting and suggestive note on Chivalry. He seeks to distinguish and isolate that particular conception of the man *comme il faut* which was the special contribution, so he avers, of the Middle Ages to our culture. He begins happily by quoting from Malory the tribute to the dead Launcelot: 'Thou wert the meekest man that ever ate in hall among ladies; and thou wert the sternest knight to thy mortal foe that ever put spear in rest.' And he asks us to observe the relevance of this double demand on human nature, of this paradoxical ideal of meekness and sternness, to the modern world.

The perpetuation of the chivalrous tradition he regards as the one hope of our modern world. If it is not possible to multiply men who combine the two sides of Launcelot's character—meekness with sternness, humility and forbearance with valour—then all talk of lasting happiness or dignity for human society is 'pure moonshine.' And the chivalrous sentiment suffers among us from two opposite reactions or tendencies. One is to scout it as part of the false glamour of war. The other is to scout it as weak and really unheroic. 'These two tendencies between them weave the world's shroud.'

But 'happily,' it is added, 'we live better than we write, better than we deserve. Launcelot is not yet irrecoverable.' We have discovered since this war began that, on the one hand, the heroic virtues are still unimpaired in the younger generation, and, on the other hand, along with sternness there is much meekness: 'from all I hear, the young pilots in the R.A.F. (to whom we owe our life from hour to hour) are not less, but more, urbane and modest than the 1915 model.'

While, then, there is still life in the chivalrous tradition that has come to us from the Middle Ages, how is that life to be maintained? The answer offered to us is this. We must cherish the knowledge that the knightly character is a work not of Nature but of art; 'of that art which has human beings, instead of canvas or marble, for its medium.' And we must do more than cherish this knowledge. But as to what in his opinion that more is, the writer of the note does not enlighten us.

However, we are grateful to him for his reminder of the value of the chivalrous sentiment and of the necessity of its perpetuation. In describing the knightly character as a work of art he supplies a hint to the Christian expositor. It should be remembered that the ideal of chivalry was conceived under the auspices of the Christian Church. In riding abroad upon his adventures the ideal knight was at once redressing human wrong and upholding the Christ. Thus the knightly character might be described as blended of Nature and grace, the artist being God, Nature His material, and grace His instrument.

But as there is no specialized class among us—as

in previous centuries—to keep alive the vestiges of chivalry, how is the people to be saved from the extremes of brutality and softness, ferocity and cowardice? Here again the Christian expositor might add a word.

It is for the Christian Church to vindicate and assert in a classless society the ideal of mediæval chivalry. True it is that some among us, even in face of the present wrong and aggression, advocate the martyr-spirit of the Early Church. But most of those who bear Christ's name advocate a more natural kind of realism. It is not regarded as of the divine intention that grace should drive out Nature. In the battle for righteousness, whether waged with arms or without them, grace and Nature should be blended together, so that meekness may not become soft and cowardly nor sternness brutal and fierce. Yet both meekness and sternness are needed if the Kingdom of God is to be advanced.

It must be added, in case of misunderstanding, that only in the last resort does Christian chivalry take up arms. Evelyn Underhill has truly said that 'the real victories of the Spirit are seldom won on battlefields, and a religious revival inspired by the practical needs of the present moment, though it might have many Old Testament or even Moslem characteristics, would be something less than Christian.'

The world crisis of to-day calls for hard, sustained and revolutionary thinking. To none does this call come with more urgency than to Christian people. A new age is dawning and much that is old and venerable is doomed to pass away. We must be ready to re-examine the articles of our creed and see that the foundations of our faith are firm. We must strive to bring the social order into closer harmony with the will of Christ and be ready to welcome any change in that direction however drastic.

To this end we must have food for thought and stimulus to our minds. It is, therefore, all to the good that there should be issued a series of 'Christian News-Letters' and 'News-Letter Books' whose design is to 'assist thought upon the relation of the Christian faith to present problems.' But such writing to be of value must be constructive and not merely critical, sane and practical rather than denunciatory. It must not follow the method of the party politician who, having denounced the whole policy of his opponents, offers no policy of his own except in high-sounding words about justice, freedom, and equality which ignore practical difficulties and lead us nowhere.

This criticism is suggested by reading the most recent issue of this series, *Christianity and the Machine Age*, by Mr. Eric Gill (Sheldon Press; 1s. 6d. net). It is written with intense vigour and conviction. It is highly stimulating and provocative. But it is too dogmatic and indeed oracular, every sentence being promoted to the dignity of a paragraph. And it is altogether one-sided.

The author begins by asking 'What is Christianity?' His answer is, 'Christianity is the religion of poverty. . . . Whatever may be said about Christianity in other respects, this at least is clear, crystal clear, clear as the stars: Christianity is the religion which blesses poverty and blesses the poor.' Again, 'It is the blessing of poverty which is the central fact of Christian sociology.' Now it is one thing to say, as Jesus did, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit (or the poor), for theirs is the kingdom of heaven,' and quite another thing to say, 'Blessed be poverty.' Jesus gave solemn warning of the spiritual dangers accompanying the possession of riches, but He never remotely suggested that His disciples should sit down in a loincloth and spin like Gandhi. Yet this is what the present writer means, if he means anything at all.

Having thus defined Christianity as the religion of poverty he launches out into a fierce attack on 'capitalist-industrialism.' He includes in the sweep of his denunciations all machinery and all machine-made things. His criticism frankly becomes a caricature. 'Machines of their very nature are, and must always be, comic—*i.e.* laughable, absurd, ludicrous . . . the locomotive is a comic version of

the dray horse.' In other words, to put a yoke upon the neck of a noble animal and from the wild freedom of the prairie to reduce it to the drudgery of a dray horse is beautiful, but to harness fire and the power of steam to man's use is ridiculous and wrong! It is not simply the abuses of the system which are here denounced, such as the prevalence of the gain motive, the undue acquisition of wealth, monotony of labour, the prostitution of scientific discoveries to destructive ends. The whole system is declared to be sub-human, despicable, and degrading, and altogether incompatible with Christianity.

Christian thinkers are not called to be defenders of 'capitalist-industrialism' or admirers of 'the machine age,' but they are required to be fair-minded in their criticisms and to preserve some historical perspective. It is not too much to say that the human race has lived by its inventiveness, by brain work far more than by hand work, by subduing Nature and harnessing its powers to his service. If man is now called to turn back upon his tracks the question rises, how far back is he to go? Is he to dispense with all machinery and return to the primitive state? But even the primitives have their machinery—the plough and the loom, the canoe and the fishing net. Stewart of Lovedale used to point out that the common spade was an instrument requiring skill for its handling as anyone could find out by putting it into the hands of a raw native.

It is easy to picture the world before the machine age as a happy Arcady where every worker was an artist rejoicing in the work of his own hands, but such pictures are entirely fanciful. Life in those days was exceedingly bare and hard; the mass of the common people lived in drudgery or actual slavery. It may be argued that without the invention of machinery to lighten labour human slavery might not yet have been abolished. This argument, however, would have no weight with the present writer who seems to think that things could not possibly be worse than they are in our time. 'For the main idea of Capitalism being what it is (the profit motive), and its instruments being what they are, the development of its method has been more damaging to the human spirit and to the expression of that spirit in human works than any slavery of the past.'

Our age is commonly dubbed 'the Acquisitive Age' and condemned as such, but man has in fact always been an acquisitive creature. Doubtless in our time he has found means for acquiring things on a bigger scale than formerly, but he has always had the hunger to acquire. His spirit in this respect has not changed or deteriorated in modern days. Even in Bible times we read of the miser hiding his treasure and the rich fool building ever bigger barns to hold his surplus crop, and we hear bitter curses pronounced upon those who add field to field and who withhold their corn from the people in time of famine. It is, to say the least, doubtful if our Lord would have seen any greater sin in the more complex exploitations of to-day. There is the same state of mind, the same sinful lust to possess in the one case as in the other. And nothing in the teaching of Jesus is clearer than this, that He had regard not so much to the magnitude of the outward act but primarily to the inward disposition and state of the heart. We may take it then that His judgment would be that the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the Word in our acquisitive age as in all times past.

We do not know to what extent the writer of this book suffers himself to be entangled in the 'sub-human and degrading' machinery of this age. It is evident that he has made use of the 'despicable' machinery of the printing press to broadcast his views. One would venture to suggest that he ought in consistency to restrict himself to a garment of camel's hair with a girdle of skin about his loins and a diet of locusts and wild honey. But in all seriousness we must enter a protest against identifying our Christian faith with these wild diatribes against our age. We believe our faith to be reasonable and such as can commend itself to thoughtful men. Heat is no substitute for light, and surely this bewildered and tortured world needs above all things light and guidance, healing and help rather than shattering denunciation. Christ is the light of the world and He came not to condemn the world but that the world through Him might be saved.

Constructive Theology.

XIII. Providence and Prayer.

By the Reverend J. G. Riddell, M.A., Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Glasgow.

Christian belief in Providence and the practice of Christian prayer are inextricably linked together. Prayer, like faith and love, it has been said, is 'robbed of eternal and ultimate significance unless the life we now live lies under the care and sovereign pity of the Father.'[1] Conversely, the offering of supplication and petition, so far from being superfluous, is natural and inevitable for those who believe that their actions fall within the control of God's providence. The difference between Christian conviction regarding Providence, moreover, and the teaching of non-Christian faiths is no less clear than the contrast between prayer within the Christian Church and prayer elsewhere. If it be true that in polytheistic religions the problem of evil hardly seems to exist, it is manifest that belief in Providence is also absent. 'The gods are in the main nature divinities, and the destroying as well as preserving powers of nature are mirrored in the pantheons, and simply accepted and dreaded.'[2] With monotheism, Dr. Cairns points out, difficulties began to appear, but it was not until the gospel of the love of God had been proclaimed that the problem of suffering became urgent. Only through Christian teaching have men been led to ask the questions which they challenge Christianity to answer, and it is all too clear to-day that with the attempt to crush out Christian faith there goes an insensitiveness to cruelty and wrong which Christianity has held in check. So it is also with the practice of prayer. '"Prayer" outside the range of Biblical religion and within it are not the same, though the term "prayer" occurs in both instances,'[3] but it does not follow that prayer is easier for the Christian than for the worshipper who feels that his wayward god must be cajoled or bribed to exercise his power aright. The offering of supplication and of petition, particularly, presents problems which Christian faith has itself created. Is there any need of asking, either for ourselves or for others, if God in His love is both willing and able to bestow, and knows better than we what it is good for us to have? Such questions can be raised only by Christian teaching, and yet there remains no doubt that in Karl Barth's phrase, 'the church, by praying and praying thus, declares that she puts her trust not in herself but in the comfort and hope, whose name is Jesus Christ.'[4]

The close connexion between Providence and prayer, as well as the reality of the problems which belief in both must encounter, becomes specially manifest in times of crisis. Difficulties raised by individual experience or a world situation may cause not a few to lose faith and condemn others to long times of perplexity. None the less the urgency of the hour and the deep personal concern of many in issues which cannot be ignored may well lead to a new seeking after truth and an earnest yearning for the assurances of religion which, no less than the temptation to doubt God, present to the Church both a challenge and an opportunity.

It is important, then, to remember that our thought about Providence and prayer cannot be separated from our Christian faith as a whole, for it is here that the difficulties of many begin and that the convictions of others may be strengthened. If we rely on Christ as the author of our salvation shall we not take Him at His word when He speaks to us of God's care? If we bow in adoration before the mystery of divine holiness revealed in Christ, or render glad thanksgiving for the unfolding of God's love in His life and death, why should we hesitate to take seriously our Lord's teaching about supplication and intercession? The vice of 'Providentialism' which becomes 'an excuse . . . for not taking action when we are lazy; or, more rarely, for justifying the action we do take when we are energetic'[5] is as much out of keeping with the teaching of the Bible concerning Providence as a magical endeavour to compel the deity to accede to our own desires is alien to the spirit of prayer in the name of Jesus. Yet we dare not ignore the insidious temptation to feel that Providence ought to do what we wish, and that we have a grievance

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, *The Christian Apprehension of God*, 220.

[2] D. S. Cairns, *The Riddle of the World*, 174.

[3] H. R. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, 187.

[4] *The Word of God and the Service of God*, 244.

[5] Julian Huxley, *Religion without Revelation*, 18.

if God does not exactly answer the prayers that we offer. All too easily we forget the Bible's insistence that our desires are often sinful and our prayers foolish. We assume too often that, in a given situation, God is on our side, when it may well be that we have not been obedient to Him and can be brought to realize the truth only by Providence dealing, as it seems, strangely with us until we learn to pray not with the self-confidence of the Pharisee, but with the Publican's cry of penitence.

Our questions about what God is doing to-day, indeed, can be answered only in the light of what He has done in the past and of the redemptive purpose of which the Bible is the record. It is foolish to try to grapple with our problems except with the clearest guidance, and for belief in Providence and for the practice of prayer alike that is to be found in the events to which the New Testament witnesses. God who so loved the world loves it still. God who was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself, still cares for the men and women whom He seeks to be His own. Our interpretation of His providential care and of His answers to our prayers cannot ignore the dark facts of human sin with which Jesus came to deal—sin that in Denney's well-known phrase is 'as real as life or death, a gigantic problem alike for God and man.'[1] Nor must we fail to recognize the glorious triumph of Christ over all the powers of evil with whom He wages warfare on man's behalf. The foolish pessimism which forgets the victory of the Cross and of the empty tomb is as untrue to the Christian gospel as the disappointment which may result from a light-hearted interpretation of divine Providence or a careless thought of what prayer really means.

Of the working of Providence in a sinless world we have no knowledge. What we do know is the way of God with a world of sinners and how Jesus spoke of His own sufferings and of His death. It must needs be, He declared, for beyond the will of the men who betrayed, condemned, and crucified our Lord, and beyond His own readiness to die, there is something inexorable, belonging to the enduring purpose of God. What daunts and amazes us—as it must have amazed the disciples—is the sense of inevitability which Jesus manifests even in His willingness to lay down His life. His enemies could have no power at all against Him except it were given them from above, but this is the Father's will for Him and there can be no other way. Christ, said St. Paul, echoing His Saviour's words, must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead. 'His sufferings were not due to chance or human violence alone, but were events lying deep in the Providence of God.'[2]

It must needs be to reveal man's sin and the dreadful outcome of it. Here is something worse, not only in degree but in kind, than the worst that men can do to one another—the putting to death of the sinless Son of God. Man's rebellion against God has led to this and here, once and for all, for all to see, is the manifesting of sin's utter horror. There can be no other way for the Son of God than this. But, beyond this, it must needs be that Jesus lay down His life, that He may take it again, to unfold the love of God, to redeem men and deliver them from sin and death. The Cross is not only the exposure of their guilt but the overcoming of their foes. Here is revealed not merely the helplessness of men to set things right but the omnipotence of forgiving love. Not only is it expedient, as Caiaphas declared, that one man should die for the people—it must needs be if new hope and courage are to be brought to men, and sinners reconciled to God, and the triumph of His purpose at the last made sure.

Faith in Providence, it has been said, is the other side of Christian faith in redemption and cannot exist apart from it, and from these two familiar truths about the death of Jesus and His rising again we may find guidance for our own perplexities and for a sinful world that is yet under God's care.

It cannot but be that men in revolt against God bring sin and suffering upon themselves and upon others. We see the truth, exemplified for ever at Calvary, writ large in the history of the world and in the events of our own day. Providence cannot be called in lightly to safeguard the race from the consequences of its own folly. God's purpose for us is not security but salvation. His plan for the world does not end with the establishment of peace on earth, but with the bringing of the glory and honour of the nations into the holy city. Providence may offer to us marvellous deliverances and unlooked-for joys, but must convince us also of our sin and elicit that penitence of heart which is the condition under which alone we can receive forgiveness. Israel was led by the testimony of the prophets to see that only by way of doom and disaster could she be brought back to God. The Prodigal owed it to the providence of God that no man gave to him the husks that the swine did eat, that he might come to himself and seek pardon in his father's house. Always the

[1] *Studies in Theology*, 94.

[2] Vincent Taylor, *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*, 19.

Bible insists, God, in His providence, may have to turn to what is His strange work that men may learn their helplessness and deepest need. It must be so, if the dreadfulness of sin is not to be concealed or men remain immune from its gravest consequences and therefore from that which may lead them to turn from it with horror in their hearts.

Yet through all the anguish of the world's life, and through the undeserved suffering which is the most terrible outcome of sin, God does not forsake His children. If He did not care enough for men to send His judgments abroad that the inhabitants of the world might learn righteousness then they could have little to hope for from His providence. Even in His judgments His love is manifest. 'Balzac,' writes Sir Herbert Grierson, 'feels no obligation to shield his heroes or heroines from the fiercest storms of life or to extricate them from their perils,' unlike Sir Walter Scott who 'played the part of a kindly providence to his children.' It may be true that in this Balzac portrays life more accurately than Scott, yet we dare not forget that the great assurance of God's providence is not that disaster never comes, or that sin's consequences are withheld, or that men in rebellion against God still live in peace—but that through disaster, suffering, and warfare His care persists. Israel in captivity found herself still in the hand of God who had covenanted with His people at the first. The Prodigal in the far country was still the father's son, and the father watched eagerly for his return. Nothing, says St. Paul, after naming all the happenings that make us question Providence, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. It is needful that man's helplessness be made plain and the folly of his pride exposed—but still, over the evil of the world, there watches the love that came into the world in Jesus, seeking to teach men with endless patience what is of true value and what they ought to cast away, insisting ever and again on the truth that their life is hid with Christ in God under a Providence that, in spite of their complainings, guards and keeps them more wondrously than they know. 'We believe that God presides over the destinies of nations as well as of individuals,' declares a pronouncement issued just before the war. 'When men in the grip of fear tend to rely on their own unaided strength and wisdom, the Churches must proclaim boldly and clearly, "The Lord thy God reigneth." They must proclaim that fact as a judgment, as a warning, and also as the basis of their faith and hope.' [1]

[1] *The Churches and the International Situation*, 19.

Again, we have no knowledge of prayer in a world without sin. The petition for daily bread, which depends upon faith in God's providential care, accompanies the prayer for forgiveness which Jesus taught His disciples to use. It had been said that 'if prayer is the heart of religion, then petition is the heart of prayer.' [2] May it not also be that if petition is the heart of prayer, then the basic petition is for pardon? This is a prayer which all of us must utter if, under God's providence, we have come to realize our indebtedness to Him. This is an expression of our dependence upon God —the way prescribed by Him by which alone we can set ourselves in the way of His blessing. We must acknowledge our sinfulness and seek His mighty help, yet such prayer is never easy. 'For a hundred men who are not afraid of the exertion of labour, there are only a few who take upon themselves the strain of prayer. Most flee from it, are afraid of it, for who would not be afraid to be alone with God? The Publican who . . . could only sigh "God be merciful to me a sinner"—prayed. But the Pharisee . . . did not pray.' [3] Those who have the experience of much forgiveness which leads to much love are led to understand God's ways so that their prayers become of more avail, the Spirit also helping their infirmities. Drawn near to God through Christ they are led by a deepening sense of His pardoning love to a fuller knowledge of what they ought to ask, and to an increasing wonder that men so helpless in face of the forces round about them should have this mighty instrument in their frail grasp. What we ask will vary with changing times and circumstances, but our confidence in prayer will grow ever greater with every experience of forgiveness, since we know that He who delivered up His own Son for us all will with Him also freely give us all things. Our fundamental prayer for ourselves and for others will be that by ways of God's ordaining we may be led to know ever more fully this amazing love. For those who do not yet believe we must pray that they may be brought, under Providence, to accept Him who on the Cross prayed, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.' 'My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved,' wrote St. Paul, and still this prayer for others must be the burden of our intercession. Within it all other intercessions will have their place. Our prayer, says Karl Barth, may be that as political rulers a government may be set aside, without its 'ceasing to be intercession

[2] H. H. Farmer, *The World and God*, 129.

[3] E. Brunner, *Our Faith*, 117 f.

for them personally before God, for their conversion and eternal salvation.'[1] For the world we must ask not merely that the havoc and suffering of war may be done away, but that men may be brought by God's guidance to apprehend His glory and accept His ways. So Dr. C. H. Dodd has written that, 'in the petition "Thy Kingdom come," we bring *this* crucial moment into the context of God's redemptive action, that His purpose in it may be accomplished. This prayer brings its own answer.'[2] Our petitions will be submissive to the divine will, yet just as our own experience of being brought near to Christ enables us to live better, so it teaches us to pray aright, with an understanding of the divine purpose which is the basis of availing prayer.

Those who bring to their belief in Providence and to their practice of prayer a sense of the abiding wonder of God's way with sinners and with a rebellious world will be free from the disillusionment which easily dismays many whose religion is superficial and unreal. 'No one in the glen had suffered so much as Marjorie,' wrote Ian Maclaren of one of his characters, 'and none was so full of peace.' We know men and women whose trust in Providence remains unbroken and who do not falter in prayer, in spite of sorrow and loss—who are an example of deep-set faith to all round them. Mystery may remain and strange perplexities. It must needs be so, for our vision is dim and our minds slow to grasp the truth. How can this suffering avail? we ask. How out of the chaos and evil of the world can good ever be brought? It seems, sometimes, so hopeless—yet, surely it is not so hopeless as the way of the Cross must have seemed to those who watched Christ die. The prayer of Jesus in Gethsemane is evidence that part of His ordeal lay in this, that even He could not see with clear vision the way in which out of apparent disaster, victory was to come. How near to us this brings our Lord, and yet how far removed we are from One who went forward confident only in His Father's care, praying not as I will, but as Thou wilt!

How could the Cross avail? If Christ had come down, as they declared, men might have believed, but dare one trust to a figure of such weakness, impotent even to save Himself? Yet the incredible thing took place. The Cross was the place of triumph; the empty tomb became the symbol of victory. The conviction by which the Church has lived and ever lives is that what is impossible with men is possible with God. In His providence and in answer to trusting prayer men's fears have been disappointed and their hopes surpassed. It is not for us to question God's ways or demand complete knowledge of His every action. Nor is it for us to claim full understanding of how prayer works and how we can be led to co-operate with God and liberate in some way the divine energies which await our prayer. It is for us, rather, to rejoice that the power which changed the Cross from a symbol of shame to the sign of love, and brought Christ triumphant from the grave, still presides over the destinies of the world and of each soul, and ever shall. It is for us to accept Christ's words concerning prayer as we accept His teaching about all our spiritual life, and to follow the example of those who have sought to pray always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, submitting ourselves to God's judgment, but laying hold also upon His wondrous mercy and the power that can do for us above all that we ask or think.

It must needs be that we share in the burden which wrong-doing has laid upon the world. None can claim immunity from anxiety and fear, weariness and sorrow, yet none is outside the compass of God's love. We are not to think in terms of an isolated event in the individual's life, however bewildering, or of one phase of history, however dark and menacing, but in the light of God's eternal providence and Christ's command to watch and pray. It may not be for us to set the whole world right, to decide great issues or devise far-reaching schemes for reconstructing civilization on new lines. We are called to live as followers of Jesus Christ in the circumstances in which God has set us to be His, and this demands that we trust in Providence and be diligent in prayer. We have the assurance that God's care of us is real in the deepest sense that all the precious things we commit to Him are kept secure whate'er betide. Prayer offered in the secret place of the Most High enables us to dwell under the shadow of the Almighty. If the revelation of God's great redeeming act be the source of our belief in Providence and our practice of prayer we have all we need to know for peace of heart and quiet endurance, for the encountering of trouble and distress, for all that life and death alike can bring. The Providence in which we trust here will not forsake us hereafter. Our prayers ascend to the Lord who sitteth King for ever. 'The start was good, if it was Christ's redemption. The way is good, if it is the way of obedience and communion. But the end is best . . . There are endings which are hopeless as midnight. But there are endings among the things which eye has not seen nor heart conceived, but which God hath prepared for them that love Him.'[3]

[1] *Op. cit.*, 230 f. [2] *History and the Gospel*, 177.

[3] Alexander Smellie, *In the Hour of Silence*.

Literature.

THE BIBLE AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

In a compact and beautifully illustrated volume, *The Bible and Archæology* (Harrap; 15s. net), by Sir Frederic Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., F.B.A., F.S.A., sometime Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum, and formerly President of the British Academy and of the Society of Antiquaries, we have one of the most masterly and accurate surveys of the results of archæological discoveries during the last hundred years, as they apply to the Bible. Such a volume, coming, as it does, from one who has had forty years' experience in the British Museum and who has been responsible for certain important expeditions to Syria and Mesopotamia, will receive the universal appreciation of scholars and the general public alike, and its conclusions bearing on the interpretation, authenticity, and text of the Bible, will command acceptance by the great majority of readers. Sir Frederic has wisely steered between the Scylla of Fundamentalism and the Charybdis of hyper-criticism, against both of which he has much to say. Unlike the Fundamentalist, he rejects the doctrine of an infallible Bible as contrary to the views of the early Christian Fathers and incompatible with modern thought; and as an unbiased judge, he condemns the attitude of destructive critics. At the same time he willingly accepts the established results of scholarship concerning the structure and date of the Old Testament books, regarding such an examination of the Bible as compatible with the profoundest faith in its teaching.

The volume deals not only with the principal excavations affecting the Old Testament, from those of Layard at Nineveh to the recent ones at Ras Shamra, Tell Halaf, Tell Atchāna, Mari, Jericho, Lachish, and elsewhere, but also with the discoveries of manuscripts, from the Codex Sinaiticus (for which Sir Frederic negotiated the purchase) to the Chester Beatty papyri and later. All throughout he has stated the results fairly and with a well-balanced judgment. In summarizing his conclusions in two final chapters, he expresses his considered opinion that the archæological evidence, so far from disturbing religious faith, has established the text of the Bible more firmly and confirmed its general authenticity, as well as given a great enrichment of the way God has revealed Himself to the world through progressive revelation. Scholars no doubt will continue to differ in the conclusions which they draw from the available evidence, for there are still perplexing problems to be cleared up, but one cannot read the author's presentation of the facts without feeling that they add to the essential trustworthiness of the Bible and help us to comprehend more intelligently its real spiritual message. One valuable benefit of the volume is its non-specialist character—it is intended not only for Biblical scholars but for students who are not themselves archæological experts.

The chronology adopted is probably the wisest in the light of present knowledge. The author points out that a margin of several centuries must be allowed in dating the Mesopotamian rulers of the second millennium, and that 'dogmatism' is here out of place. Thus Hammurabi, of the First Dynasty of Babylon, had been placed by some scholars as early as 2123 B.C. and by Sidney Smith as late as probably 1850 B.C.; and while Sir Frederic seems inclined to accept Hammurabi's identification with Amraphel in Gn 14^{1}, he concludes that, 'in default of further evidence, it would not be safe to depend upon it.' As for the vexed question of the date of the Exodus, while accepting the earlier date, *c.* 1440 (which he states is now the prevalent view), he feels that it is difficult to reconcile the details of the Amarna Letters with the narrative of Joshua. This, of course, is natural, for the Letters of Abdi-hiba are concerned solely with the Hebrew-Habiru attack on Jerusalem, which did not take place till some time after Joshua's death (cf. Jg $1^{1ff.}$), and there had been ample time for rulers and events to change.

All interested in the Bible will feel thankful to the author for supplying them with such a valuable increment of knowledge, and we are sure the volume (which is provided with an excellent index of subjects and names) will have a wide sale in Britain, America, and elsewhere, as it deserves to have.

J. W. Jack.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

Three years ago Principal Vincent Taylor presented, in 'Jesus and His Sacrifice,' not only the results of a New Testament scholar's investigation of the Passion-sayings of our Lord, but also the theological inferences which such investigation suggests. *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching* (Epworth Press; 8s. 6d. net) provides a similar

study of the primitive preaching and belief about the death of Christ, of the form given to the earlier tradition by the great New Testament teachers, and of the developments of the doctrine found in Pauline and Johannine literature and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The rich variety of teaching in the New Testament and the emphasis laid now on this aspect of the truth and now on that are clearly set forth. The silence of certain writers concerning the themes to which others give prominence is discussed no less carefully than the great convictions which are shared by all. The gradual development of the belief that the Atonement has to do both with man's sins and with his blessedness, that it is throughout a work of God, whose love is directed to the highest moral and spiritual ends, universal in its scope and leading to reconciliation between man and man, is examined, and the importance of such elements in it as faith-union with the crucified Redeemer, the relation of eucharistic teaching to the doctrine of the Atonement and the unity of the whole divine action are wisely stressed. Such a survey will be of the greatest interest and help not only to theologians but to every preacher who seeks to set before his people no meagre gospel but the wide range of New Testament teaching concerning Christ and Him crucified. Dr. Taylor has added still further to the indebtedness which many in all branches of the Church already owe to his careful scholarship and theological insight.

The main conclusions of the various sections are gathered together in a Summary appended to each, and the last part of the book provides a similar Summary for the New Testament as a whole, indicating the implications of the evidence offered and discussing the more ultimate problems which are involved. The view of the Atonement accepted in 'Jesus and His Sacrifice' is reaffirmed, and the category of sacrifice, rightly understood, is declared to be most closely in line with the teaching of Scripture as a whole and to serve 'the needs of thought, of preaching, of worship and the devotional life, and of practical service,' while it 'already contains within itself, or can easily be harmonized with the positive merits of other theories.'

One could wish for no more attractive presentation than this of the idea of sacrifice which has never been absent from the Church's thought concerning the Atonement and which has received fresh emphasis in our own time. Studies in comparative religion and in the teaching of the Old Testament have lessened some, at least, of the difficulties which have been felt regarding it. Principal Taylor suggests, moreover, that misunderstanding of its true meaning has obscured its value and finds in it a message applicable to the problems of to-day.

Discussion, none the less, will naturally arise as, indeed, the author himself anticipates. Principal Taylor has sought to do justice to other theories, including 'the widespread but disintegrating conviction that we have said all that is important about the Atonement when we declare that Christ died in order to embody and make known the love of God for men.' He has brought within the category of sacrifice elements often neglected, particularly in the Anselmic type of theory, while he admits the possible strength of substitutionary doctrine though at the same time carefully distinguishing between the misleading notion of Christ as our substitute and the idea of His being our representative in the vicarious sense which is vital to the sacrificial theory. The Abailardian may still feel difficulties in this; the modern defender of the Anselmic position may hold that his interpretation is no less capable of restatement than the sacrificial theory; those who accept the 'classic view' may not be content with the suggestion that it represents only a part of Paul's teaching, and 'one which is not integrated with his main contentions.' Behind such possible divergence of view, however, lies a fundamental difficulty in regard to which Principal Taylor again earns our gratitude by his frankness. Is any one category adequate for a truth which must always be too great for us and which the New Testament itself sets forth in varied ways? 'No general conception is sufficiently wide to include a doctrine so unique as the doctrine of the Atonement.' If the best we can use is that which 'finds room for a greater range of New Testament teaching and experience than any other', the idea of sacrifice, so persuasively set forth in these pages, has much to commend it, and the further volume promised by the author shortly on the same theme from the point of view of Christian experience will be awaited with interest and expectation. J. G. RIDDELL.

F. R. TENNANT'S THEISM.

Dr. F. R. Tennant of Cambridge has received a well-merited compliment from America. In May, 1939, there was a Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University in candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It was from the pen of Mr. Delton Lewis Scudder, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Ethics and Religion

in Wesleyan University, and was a study of Dr. Tennant's work in philosophical theology. It has now been published as one of the series of Yale Studies in Religious Education under the title, *Tennant's Philosophical Theology* (Milford ; 18s. 6d. net).

At first sight one wonders why the book should be regarded as a contribution to the subject of Religious Education. But closer contact shows that the writer's fundamental conviction is one on which, if valid, the educationist would be expected to build. It is that religious experience is a unique function of the whole normal rational mind as it makes an empirical contact with religious reality. It is an intuitive awareness which rises above the discursive reason to grasp the reality of God. This grasp is not infallible, nor complete, but it is subject to its own type of empirical verification.

With this conviction as his guiding-star the writer examines and criticises Dr. Tennant's theistic positions. He recognizes in Dr. Tennant's work a major defence of theism. But he cannot allow that theism can be established by rational argument alone ; and, in particular, that the design argument can be empirically validated, apart—that is—from any antecedent or independent apprehension of the Divine.

The writer also examines Tennant's criticisms of religious experience as having no unique value for the validation of theism, and thereafter proceeds to the constructive portion of his work, in which religious experience is taken to be the primary ground of theism, and the interconnexion and interdependence of the principal arguments for theism are set forth. It is urged that theism offers a more reasonable explanation of the world than mechanism, chance, or unconscious purpose. But the theistic principle of explanation is not to be confused with the actual reality of religious experience. Rather is it that it confirms the supposition that the God of religious experience is also the God of the cosmos. On the other hand, religious experience cannot by itself establish the theistic explanation of the world.

There is no doubt that Dr. Tennant's high rational method in theistic apologetics has not won much favour among recent writers in philosophical theology, and that Dr. Scudder aligns himself with the prevalent trend in theistic exposition. But Dr. Tennant is to be reckoned with, and readers of this volume should gain a clear impression both of what Dr. Tennant has to say for himself and of what others have been saying against him, whether directly or indirectly. It is a goodly volume (though not free from inaccuracies), and the author is to be congratulated upon it ; for it is happily conceived, and is the product of much careful and competent study. W. Fulton.

METHODISM AS A LITERARY FORCE.

Another book about the Wesleys and their Methodism might seem superfluous, but *Methodism and the Literature of the Eighteenth Century*, by Mr. T. B. Shepherd, M.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press ; 10s. 6d. net), will not be classed as such. Surveying 'the whole subject' of Methodism in eighteenth-century literature, it discusses the literary relations and contributions of the Wesleys and other Methodist writers, the attitude of contemporary authors, and the influence of Methodism on literary development. Illustrations abound without being tedious ; theological issues and religious controversy are largely overlooked ; and there is a sound historical perspective. There is also a good Bibliography and an Index.

If some of the material is familiar there is freshness in the treatment of the Wesleys as diarists, letter-writers, and poets, with their critical taste and opinions. Much less known is the mass of publications—controversial, political, educational, and literary, including many vigorously edited abridgements of other authors, which John issued for the popular enlightenment. To have digested these into an informative and readable account is no small feat.

Other Methodist writers of the period are neither numerous—partly owing, it appears, to a kind of literary censorship exercised by Wesley—nor much remembered, though they include poets of some merit, and the 'Lives of the Early Methodist Preachers,' autobiographies written originally for the *Arminian Magazine*, deserve far wider recognition both for their style and substance. Wesley's 'helpers' had both talents and adventures out of the ordinary.

Contemporary references to Methodism are rarely favourable, though some are not quite without sympathy. Clerics denounced it ; poets declaimed against it ; journals and magazines were hostile ; it was pilloried on the stage—often with an astonishing wealth of invective and scurrility. Happier aspects are seen, however, in the associations of Wesley and Dr. Johnson, here examined in detail, and in the influence of Methodism on Cowper or Blake, 'the greatest poet of the Evangelical Revival.' Finally, although Wesley himself was a man of his age, with strictly classical tastes, the

temper of his Methodism was congenial to Romanticism, and did much to encourage it. He unleashed forces, some of whose effects, in literature as in life, he could not have imagined and would, perhaps, have disapproved. PHILIP S. WATSON.

ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY.

What is the essential difference between Muhammadanism and Christianity? Many would answer their conceptions of God, or their moral ideals, or the like. But these must be traced back to something much more fundamental, to a psychological clash in their widely divergent definitions of 'the spirit' and 'the spiritual.' To the Western mind these always mean the immaterial, the non-physical, while to the Semitic mind there is no such antithesis. To the Western thinker 'the primary entity is the spirit and the spiritual, whereas to the Semitic mind the primary entity is the body and physical existence.' Hence, in orthodox Islam, the spirit is non-spiritual, is corporeal. 'This principle is basic in Moslem mentality.' 'Hence to say that God is spirit, which is a perfectly simple Christian principle, is quite repulsive to the Moslem mind.' 'People often think the chief hindrance to Christianity in the mind of the Moslem is Christian faith in the Sonship of Jesus Christ, and this is undeniably true; but it is the non-spiritual conception of the spiritual that makes this faith repellent to Moslem mentality, since it regards spirit as belonging to the realm of the physical'; and so on.

This is the argument that is hammered in, over and over again, in an interesting little book, *Studies in the Relationship between Islam and Christianity*, by Lootfy Levonian, Dean of the School of Theology at Beirut (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), with much knowledge and no little ability.

The volume falls into two sections—the first psychological, the second historical—a series of studies bringing out the tolerance which Muhammadanism was wont to show till soured by the Crusades, contrasted with the much less friendly attitude of many Christians, and ending with a plea to get along side one another these days when Muhammadanism is once more wakening from sleep, and ending up what history has proved to be its mighty intellect and strength.

A. J. GOSSIP.

ITALIAN NATIONALISM AND ENGLISH LITERATURE.

The author of *Italian Nationalism and English Letters*, Mr. Harry W. Rudman (Allen & Unwin; 18s. net), has worked hard to create an interest in his subject and has partially succeeded. His aim is to set forth the effect upon English literature of the politics of nineteenth-century Italy, and especially of the personal influence of the leaders of the *Risorgimento*, the period covered being roughly from 1830 to 1882. His style is rather stilted and some of his idioms are surprising, but the main characters live in his pages. It would have been better, indeed, if he had concentrated more on these main characters and upon the more conspicuous illustrations of their literary influence. The book is overcrowded with references to persons who are not of first importance for the understanding of the period, and the list of insignificant publications inspired or influenced by the Italian situation has a dangerously close resemblance to a catalogue. Occasionally a certain trans-Atlantic superiority displays itself, and our author becomes slightly cynical about our Victorian political attitude to Italian aims, as, for example, when he suggests that a free Italy meant valuable commerce for England, and allows himself to dwell rather exultantly upon the clash between Gladstone's private admiration for Garibaldi and the political embarrassment which was caused by the exuberant enthusiasm of the popular welcome. On the whole, Mr. Rudman is rather puzzled by Mazzini. He calls him a 'saint slightly damaged,' and would probably sympathize with Drinkwater's verdict that Mazzini 'always knew the right thing to do, but never the right time to do it.' The chapter on Cavour might have been expanded with advantage. The most interesting part of the book is that which deals with Garibaldi, although the author is not quite in sympathy with his subject, and accepts with too little protest opinions like that of Livingstone, who said that 'Garibaldi had fists of iron and brains of cheese.' The relationships which are treated of in the book are represented as being in the main cordial and sincere. There is no attempt made to explain away the intensity of the indignation which was caused by Lord Aberdeen's interference with Mazzini's correspondence, and, although Mr. Rudman does suggest that the British welcome to the Italian exiles owed something to its being the prevailing fashion—'to the nineteenth century the patriot of an oppressed country was as attractive as the idealized noble savage had been to the eighteenth'—yet over and over again he vividly indicates the depth and value of the friendships which were established between the Italians and the leading English writers of the period. In Meredith's *Vittoria* he finds 'the high-water mark

of Mazzini's influence on English letters,' and he quotes convincingly from Carlyle, the Brownings, Swinburne, and many others. A most comprehensive bibliography adds to the value of a useful book. W. S. URQUHART.

EX LIBRIS.

To a book-lover few 'finds' could be more welcome than a work like *Ex Libris*, by Mr. E. E. Kellett (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net). It is described by its author as 'Confessions of a Constant Reader,' and that exactly fits the book. Many years ago, a newspaper induced well-known men to draw up a list of 'the best hundred books.' The interest aroused was extraordinary. Everybody soon became busy making their own lists, and doubtless the 'stunt' was the means of introducing us to books of which we knew little or nothing. It would not, perhaps, be too great an exaggeration to say that a list of the best thousand books could be compiled from Mr. Kellett's confessions. There cannot have been in this country a more 'constant' reader. He began quite early with sound literature. Between the ages of nine and thirteen he read Addison's *Spectator*, Cowper, Tupper (for whom he has a good word), Shelley, Pope, Macaulay's *History*, Scott, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Farrar, and many other works of lesser significance. As time passed, bigger game came to his gun, and he records faithfully the reading of each period, seven to nine, nine to thirteen, thirteen to sixteen, then the university period, and thereafter to the present. He was omnivorous, but in addition he displays an amazing memory. The books read in each period are not only mentioned but valued. It is interesting for any one of about the same age as the author to come on book after book read about the same period. We, too, were thrilled by *The Scottish Chiefs*, in spite of its twisted history. We also were fascinated by 'Jackanapes,' and 'Tom Brown,' and later by Macaulay, and Gibbon, and R. L. S.

To read this book is to receive successive shocks of pleasure as bygone delights are recalled. But it is also to debate with the author his judgments on favourites. He was carried away by Stevenson at first, but later he compares him unfavourably with Scott. He even depreciates his 'wisdom,' that attitude to life which did so much for many of us at an impressionable period. It is seldom, however, that one seriously differs from the author. We share his enthusiasm for Gibbon and Macaulay. But almost any book seems to have interested him, and even second- and third-raters are often welcomed because of the light they throw on their own age.

The latter part of the book is shadowed by an increasing perplexity about the deeper problems of life. Mr. Kellett took to philosophy in these latest years, and it has apparently left him without much definite assurance about anything. But it has left his devotion to literature unquenched, and we go on to the end sharing his discoveries and benefiting also by the mild wisdom which a lifetime's reading and reflection have imparted to him.

F. J. RAE.

THE THEOLOGY OF JESUS.

In *The Theology of Jesus* (Nicholson & Watson; 9s. 6d. net) the Rev. A. T. Cadoux, B.A., D.D., admirably fills a gap in our discussions of New Testament theology. Against the accusation of stupidity and bad taste he defends his task by observing that to speak of the ethics of Jesus 'is but to say that inward consistency is observable in His sayings about conduct,' and with justice he asks: 'Why should not the same be thought of His sayings about God?' In a full and detailed exposition he discusses such themes as Belief in God, the Kingdom of God, Providence, Satan and the Demons, God and Man, Human Nature, Himself, the Son of Man, Jesus and Men, Jesus and Israel, His Death. The general tendency of the work is that of a liberal orthodoxy. Dr. Cadoux holds that 'the mass of the teaching attributed to Jesus in the first three Gospels is the product of one supreme mind and one supreme experience' (p. 12), and he carefully bases his discussion upon the widely accepted results of source-criticism, but makes surprisingly little use of the Fourth Gospel. He is plainly on his guard against 'traditional theology,' and, instead of speaking of Sin, prefers to discuss Self-defeat and Desire, Human and Divine, and instead of using the phrase, the Person of Christ, selects the heading 'Himself.' Here, however, there is a very valuable treatment of the title 'Son of Man,' for which we cannot be too grateful. The sayings and parables of Jesus are examined in great detail. Often Dr. Cadoux begins a paragraph with a saying, and weaves his estimate of its significance into his argument; and, once the reader is familiar with his method, the exposition is as interesting as it is illuminative. A preacher, in particular, will find the book to be of great value, not because it contains sermons, but because of the many seed-thoughts found in its pages. It

is not to be expected, of course, that Dr. Cadoux always carries us with him in his theories and suggestions. To explain Mk 10^{45}, for example, by saying: 'Jesus enfranchised His followers by giving them an effective lead in self-giving' (p. 272), seems a quite inadequate explanation of this most important saying; and the same criticism may be brought against his account of the sorrow of Gethsemane as caused by Israel's rejection 'of what He asked of them for God' (p. 289). Indeed, the whole discussion of the death of Christ, while stimulating and very suggestive, is restricted by an anxiety not to transcend the strict limitations of the sources at command, although a fine thought shines through the comment on Mk 15^{34}. 'The cry, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" tells us that in His act of self-giving, in the utter sorrow of His love, Jesus had left behind all available conceptions of God in an experience that was to give the world for the first time a conception of God effective for its deepest needs, "Christ crucified," "the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Co $1^{23f.}$)' (p. 297). But when all criticisms have been made, here is a noble book, worthy to be bought, read, and carefully pondered. Dr. Cadoux has made us his debtors. VINCENT TAYLOR.

Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D., has issued a cheap edition of a work first published in 1919, *The Early Christian Attitude to War* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). The work is a notable contribution to the history of Christian Ethics, and this reprint of it makes a timely appearance. After examining the teaching of Jesus on the subject of war the author analyses on the basis of the Greek and Latin patristic sources the forms both of the early Christian disapproval of war and of the early Christian acceptance of war. While he does not conceal his own 'pacifist' views, he tries to play the rôle of the impartial historian; and he recognizes that for the practical guidance of Christians to-day other considerations than exegetical and historical have a proper place.

Who is this King of Glory?, by the Rev. William Hallock Johnson, Ph.D., D.D. (American Tract Society; $1.50), is written from a conservative standpoint, but the author is justified in claiming 'a good critical conscience.' On the basis of a somewhat diffused citation of Scripture passages he builds up the argument that only a full acknowledgment of the Divinity of Christ as the Son of God can explain either the origin or the effects of Christianity. His analysis of the self-disclosure passages in Mt 11 and Lk 10 is particularly good, as also is his exposition of the testimony of the Epistle to the Hebrews. He treats the fundamental Christian belief that God is love as an inevitable inductive inference from the historical revelation in Christ, and conversely he shows that the belief leads deductively to the necessity of a historic manifestation of the Divine Love and a supreme act of sacrifice such as is exhibited in the Cross of Christ. He deals effectively with the stock adverse criticisms of the factuality of the Resurrection, and successfully shows that a full-orbed theism has never maintained itself apart from the belief enshrined in Christian doctrine. The book is devotional as well as expository and philosophical, and, although we are occasionally disconcerted by the substitution of assertion for argument, the unity of the book is not unduly disturbed.

It is heartening to find a working minister in a busy parish facing up to one of the big problems of the Faith. This is what the Rev. David C. Mitchell, M.A., does in *The Gospel of the Cross* (James Clarke; 2s. net). He has been reading some of the bigger books on the Atonement, and with their help he has found his way to the message of the Cross. There is nothing very original here, unless in the sense that every one who looks at truth with his own eyes, and says what he sees in his own words, is original; and perhaps that is the best kind of originality. There is no new theory at any rate. The conclusions of the book are just the orthodox catholic conclusions, but we find from the writer an intelligent statement of the grounds on which they may be honestly held.

The three chapters are entitled 'The Approach to the Cross,' 'The Gospel of the Cross,' and 'The Cross in Daily Life.' In the last chapter Mr. Mitchell draws a Pacifist conclusion from the way of the Cross. He is an ardent and wholehearted Pacifist. But the reader to whom this is unwelcome may be advised to ignore it and receive the message of the book for itself.

Many readers are familiar with the weekly devotional column in the Methodist Recorder which the Rev. Francis B. James has contributed for several years under the heading 'For the Quiet Hour.' A number of these short articles have already been published, and now there appears a second selection under the title of *Still With Thee* (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). These devotional studies are

excellent of their kind, not suitable for critical review, but full of helpful thoughts and spiritual stimulus when used as daily readings. The writer is doing in our day the kind of work that J. R. Miller and Andrew Murray did so admirably a generation ago, and no higher praise could be given.

Dr. Hobart D. McKeehan has been spoken of by the 'Manchester Guardian' as 'one of the greatest of America's younger clergymen.' A taste of his quality is given in *What Men Need Most* (Fortuny's, New York; 4s. net), a little book containing ten short sermons. They make interesting reading. The preacher shows a wide acquaintance with modern literature, and he makes abundant and skilful use of his knowledge. His sermons are lit up with touches of poetic imagination, his criticism of life is acute, and he speaks as a Christian man deeply in earnest.

Principal F. J. Paul's Cunningham Lectures for 1938 are now published under the title of *Romanism and Evangelical Christianity* (Hodder & Stoughton; 16s. net). It is an able and fully documented exposition, and, one might say, exposure of the characteristic doctrines and practices of the Roman Church. No doubt to the Protestant minority in Ireland Romanism must appear a more immediately threatening and hostile power than it does in countries where, conscious of its numerical weakness, it presents itself with more plausibility. Principal Paul, as Professor of Church History in the Presbyterian College, Belfast, writes with a keen edge of criticism and with considerable vigour of language in regard to the false claims and superstitious practices that have crept into and corrupted the worship of the Roman Church. At the same time, he is scrupulously fair and by no means blind to the great elements of Christian truth and devotion in the life of that Church. Perhaps the chief value of his work consists in the fullness of historical evidence he brings to bear on the questions at issue. He moves at ease through the Christian centuries, and gathers an immense mass of relevant material from the decrees of the Church and the writings of the Fathers. His book is a veritable armoury which will supply stores of effective weapons to counter the attacks and refute the undue pretensions of the Roman Catholic Church.

For a church in the heart of London to continue through three centuries in health and vigour is a notable achievement. This is the proud record of the City Temple, and its history well deserves to be written. The work has been ably done by Mr. Albert Clare, the Hon. Treasurer of the church, and is now published under the title of *The City Temple 1640–1940—The Tercentenary Commemoration History* (Independent Press; 5s. net). It is a book very well worth reading and a book that many will prize. The bulk of it is naturally devoted to the more recent history of the City Temple, dating from the coming of Joseph Parker in 1852. Full justice is done to his genius and to the line of stalwarts who followed him—R. J. Campbell, Fort Newton, Norwood, and Leslie Weatherhead. It is a very inspiring record. The whole is introduced in a Foreword by the Rev. Leslie Weatherhead who enters into a somewhat superfluous defence of the popular preacher, supplemented by some acid remarks on the unpopular preacher. About a score of illustrations add to the interest of the book.

Can We Know God?, by the Rev. Frederic C. Spurr (Lutterworth Press; 2s. net), is modestly described as 'not a treatise but a practical little brochure for ordinary people.' It is certainly not bulky but it is written with great clearness and is very illuminating. Beginning with a criticism of Julian Huxley's 'Religion without Revelation' the writer goes on to show the necessity of revelation arising from the fact of personality in God and man. Thereafter he discusses the progressiveness of revelation and the relation between what is final and what is continuous. It is a little book which can be warmly commended as fitted to give a plain and intelligible view of the profound subject of which it treats.

In *War and the Purposes of God*, by the Rev. W. W. Lucas, M.A., LL.M. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 5s. net), we have an uncommonly wide survey of Scripture teaching. Every reader will be struck with the extraordinary wealth of references. It would be difficult to find a page where there are not at least half a dozen references to texts in the footnotes, and quite commonly these references may be from a dozen to a score in number. Practically everything in the Bible referring to war is here dealt with. It is to be regretted, however, that these texts and passages are quoted so indiscriminately and are charged in many cases with a fullness of meaning which their context will not bear out. The general teaching of the book is that God reigns, that He is ever active in the affairs of nations as well as men, that in His righteous judgment He brings wars upon them, and that only

through repentance and submission to His will and active co-operation with His purpose can nations hope to live and prosper.

Those for whom the Psalter is a part of the daily worship will always be glad of help in appreciating the background of the Psalms which they read or sing. They will find useful a little book by the Rev. Cuthbert C. Keet, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., entitled *The Psalms: A Brief Introduction* (Mowbray; 2s. net). It falls into three parts, one dealing with the composition and structure of the Psalter, one with the outlook of the Psalmist—a short summary of the theology of the Psalter—and the third with the Psalms in public worship and private devotion. Dr. Keet obviously speaks out of his own experience, and tries to hand on to others something of what the Psalms have meant to him. He is well aware of the modern position on the Psalter, though he is inclined to a later dating of some pieces than most recent commentators would allow; few to-day would accept a Maccabean date for anything in the book, though the possibility of a late revision is not to be ignored. In dealing with the structure, too, the author might have made more use of what is generally agreed as to the form of Hebrew poetry. But matters of this kind are not Dr. Keet's primary concern, and he has used just so much of them as will, he believes, best fit his purpose.

The Discussion Books Series must be fulfilling a very useful purpose if all the books included in it are as good as *Studies in Medieval Thought*, by G. G. Coulton, Litt.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A. (Nelson; 2s. 6d. net). It is compact of valuable information and illuminating ideas. Dr. Coulton holds that the Middle Ages are for us of more than academic or dramatic interest. They are 'the story of a catastrophe, involving the whole of Europe—the unmaking of the whole ancient world and the making of a new social order.' Parallels with our own times are obvious; for one thing, in the period of the decay of the Roman Empire all that the world wanted was peace at any price, even at the price of despotism, and who can say that this situation has not been repeated in certain parts of Europe? Dr. Coulton passes in review the work of some of the outstanding leaders of the Middle Ages—from Augustine to Nicholas of Cusa. He is specially good on John the Scot and on Abelard, but of all he makes us think more understandingly than we could do without his help. Towards the achievements of the Middle Ages as a whole he would have us be neither too critical nor too reactionary. We must not underrate the services of Medieval thought, nor overrate the moral aspect of the civilization of the Dark Ages. The thinkers of the period sought earnestly for an ordered Universe above the actual disordered world; but, because they could not dispute the fundamentals—except at the peril of their lives—they were inclined to be disputatious on minor points, and narrowly parochial. Further, there was a division between the higher and the lower thought of the time, which resulted in a certain artificiality and had as its further consequence a greater divorce between theory and practice than in our own times.

Much has been written to emphasize the difference between the teaching of Jesus and the theology of St. Paul. The Apostle of the Gentiles has been held to be the founder of dogmatic Christianity and the line has been sharply drawn between the primitive faith and his more speculative system. These contentions, while they have occupied a large place in the work of critical schools, have never made much impression on the common Christian mind. The essential unity of the New Testament faith is too apparent. Common sense also would indicate that St. Paul must have been intensely interested in the teaching and work of Jesus, and that he must have had ample means of making himself fully acquainted with the facts. As Professor C. H. Dodd remarks, when Paul spent fourteen days with Peter in Jerusalem, 'We may presume that they did not spend all their time talking about the weather.' But the subject of Paul's relation to the primitive Church is still in debate, and Professor A. M. Hunter, B.D., Ph.D., D.Phil., has devoted his Hastie Lectures to *Paul and his Predecessors* (Nicholson & Watson; 4s. 6d. net). It is a careful and scholarly piece of work, minutely exegetical and well balanced. The writer inclines if anything to exaggerate St. Paul's dependence on the teaching and practice of the primitive Church, though he expressly disclaims any idea of diminishing his greatness and originality. He has undoubtedly brought an immense mass of evidence to show that 'many stones in the great edifice of Paulinism were already quarried and hewn into rough shape before the "master-builder" took them over.'

A second series of *The Children's Pulpit*, edited by the Rev. J. R. Lumb, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), has been issued. It contains thirty-five sermons for the children's service, but unlike the

former series, which contained single sermons by different preachers, it is divided up into short courses of sermons, each course by a single writer. The principal topics treated are, Six Christian Festivals, Ash Wednesday to Good Friday, My Duty Towards God, Sermons for Trinity-Tide, and the Seven Sacraments. It will be seen that it practically covers the Christian Year, and its main intention is to give the children orderly instruction in regard to the Christian Sacraments and Festivals. Some will doubtless feel that it is too 'churchy' and its quality is somewhat unequal, but it should be found very helpful especially to teachers of the Church of England.

The Village on the Hill, by Mr. John Maarten (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), is a story of the Church conflict in Germany. Within a year of publication the book has had three editions in German, and has been translated into five languages. It is a plain unvarnished tale, told with moving simplicity, of how a little village church in Germany was first awakened from spiritual slumber by its young pastor, and then swept into valiant conflict for its faith with the ruling power in the State. The pastor, Stefan Grund, is a noble figure of the heroic type of Niemöller, and his expositions of Christian truth and Church principles to his simple parishioners are apostolic. It is a timely book to remind us that in Germany there are yet seven thousand that have not bowed the knee to Baal.

Towards a New Way of Life (S.C.M.; 6d.) is a little twenty-page pamphlet issued anonymously. It is divided into seven sections, each providing material for meditation on some central Christian truth with appropriate suggestions for re-dedication. It is, perhaps, too compressed to be really effective, but it will provide the earnest reader with much food for self-examination.

Some Thoughts on the Atonement.

I.

By the Reverend David S. Cairns, D.D., Emeritus Principal of Christ's College, Aberdeen.

There is general agreement among all serious students of the New Testament that the apostolic witnesses almost without exception ascribe central importance to the Cross of Christ. They proclaim the Gospel of the Forgiveness of Sin, and they say that Christ has made this Forgiveness possible by His Cross and Passion. No doubt it is St. Paul above all who finds in the Cross the secret of the new standing of Free Grace, in which all true Christians should live. But it is clear from their writings that practically all the other New Testament writers take a like view. They who desire, therefore, to think and live in the New Testament world of faith and morals cannot but seek to answer the question *why* the Cross of Christ is of vital importance for the Christian life and for communion with God. In other words, if they are to give an account of this faith to reasonable men and women, they must have a doctrine of Reconciliation or Atonement.

This necessity has been felt from the very first. All down the ages Christian thinkers have pondered over this question and each age has had its own way of answering it. To this master task of Christian theology the English-speaking peoples have contributed their full share. I doubt if any language, ancient or modern, since the New Testament was written, has contributed more. One Scottish theologian at least—Macleod Campbell—has written a volume on *The Nature of the Atonement* that stands among the very greatest, and since then we have had a succession of notable books on the subject in Britain and America. The latest of these, Dr. Macaulay's fine volume on *The Death of Jesus*, published two years ago, opens up new lines of thought and shows that interest in the great theme is unexhausted.

No doctrine, moreover, has so interesting a history, for when we look closely into the great historic theories we find that nearly every one of them mirrors its own age, and uses the categories of its own phase of social development to explain why the death of Christ was necessary to reconcile Man and God. I shall simply enumerate the five different theories, or rather groups of theory, and

shall then draw an obvious conclusion from the survey, before passing on to the heart of our subject. The first of these was the Ransom Theory. Christ died in order to ransom mankind from the power of the devil, sin, and death. This theory prevailed in the Church for a thousand years more or less. Next came the Satisfaction Theory of Anselm. On this view the death of Christ was not a price paid by God to the devil, but a debt paid to the Divine Creditor, a satisfaction given by Christ to the Father for His honour which had been wounded by the sins of Man. Next came in succession two forms of the Penal Theory of the Atonement. The first of these, like that of Anselm, viewed the death of Christ as a satisfaction for sin, but it was paid by Christ taking on Himself the punishment of man as a substitutionary victim. He did this not as a satisfaction for wounded personal *honour*, but as a satisfaction to the outraged *justice* of God. The other form of the Penal Theory is that known as the Governmental view of Grotius, the great Dutch jurist. While Grotius uses much of the terminology of the penal substitution view, the Atonement is not by him regarded, primarily, as that of an offering to the Divine justice for its appeasement. Christ gives Himself up as a victim in the interests of public justice. He died not to propitiate God, but to preserve and increase man's reverence for the law of God. Only in this way could the public justice or, in other words, the moral order in the Universe be preserved. He died to *show* that the Governor of the Universe is just, and thereby to maintain that order in which alone society is possible.

We have here a forerunner of the last great group of theories known as the Moral Theories which are characteristic of our own age. In these theories the main, though not the exclusive, stress was laid on the principle that Christ's death was necessary to show the love of God for all men. God so loved men that to express it Christ His Son died on the Cross for them all.

Now all these five theories have points of attachment in the New Testament. And it is quite undeniable that great Christian lives have been lived and great and lasting achievements wrought by those who held them as part of their faith. The Pagan Empire was won and the Northern peoples evangelized by men who believed that Christ died to ransom us from the devil. This, as its name indicates, is the reflex of an age of warfare, and has therefore been called (by Professor W. P. Paterson) the Military Theory. Anselm's theory prevailed in the spiritual glory of the mediæval times, that wonderful age which produced the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, the Franciscan Revival, and the scholastic philosophies. The theory certainly reflects to some extent feudal conceptions of honour and mediæval conceptions of penance. The penal substitutionary theory prevailed in the heart of the great Reformation period. The Governmental theory of Grotius, in which some see the reflex of the modern democratic state with its conception of social order under the sovereignty of equal laws, was that held by outstanding theologians of the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century. The Moral Theory though its origin was earlier, is that by which many true saints and heroes of our modern age have lived. Though its origin lies in the Middle Ages do we not see in the books of its exponents constant use of ideas of the liberal and humanitarian age, the sacredness of personality, autonomy, freedom and emphasis on the moral and social in the life of man. That there is something eternally true in each of these theories of Atonement, I believe. Yet to try to combine them in an eclectic way would be as futile as mere eclecticism always is.

But I should hope that when Christian thought came finally to rest on this great theme (if that consummation should ever be reached in this world), the resulting statement would be such as not only to 'shine by its own light,' but have something in it which satisfied the main intention at least of all the great historic theories of the Atonement. This article is a tentative essay directed to such a result. It makes no claim to be a full statement. The view of the Atonement presented in it is not precisely that of any of the five theories of which I have spoken, each of which fails completely to satisfy me. But it is based mainly on the Moral Theory though in certain aspects it endeavours to pass beyond it.

It is impossible to-day for me at least to accept the Ransom Theory in its popular form, though Bishop Aulén in his recent volume, *Christus Victor*, has shown how much more there is in it than that form expresses. That God should be under any kind of moral obligation to pay a ransom for mankind to the author of all evil is certainly a violent hypothesis.

Nor can I think the Satisfaction Theory of Anselm, in spite of its wide prevalence, one in which either the mind or the heart of man can rest. It seems to me unbiblical, for the New Testament always represents that Atonement is meant to reconcile man to God and not God to man, and, in addition to other difficulties, the fatal objection to it is that it brings moral division into the very heart of the Trinity. How can one member of the Trinity satisfy the wounded honour of another, without

there being some initial moral divergence of moral judgment as to the wrongdoer and his evil deeds. Incidentally the Son must appear more placable than the Father. We do not escape this difficulty if, as does Anselm, we think of the Christ who makes satisfaction as representing man. For to Anselm he is also Son of God and a member of the Holy Trinity and therefore His honour too needs to be satisfied. We have to introduce therefore a moral dualism into the personality of the God Man. As Son of God He requires satisfaction and as Son of man He gives it. The theory is, it seems to me, quite unworkable. This may be denied, but I defy any one to preach it to plain or young people without conveying that impression. The fatal result of this has been that the Father in popular religion has too often appeared as a Being, just, stern, remote and awful, and Christ as a gentler and more loving being, and the salvation which He wrought as salvation, not as the Ransom Theory had taught, salvation from Sin and Death and the Devil, but as salvation from God. What child or unlettered person, for instance, could possibly derive any other impression from such words as these :

The Father lifted up his rod, O Christ it fell on thee;
Thou wast sore stricken of Thy God, there's not one stroke for me.
Thy tears, Thy blood beneath it flowed,
Thy Bruising healeth me.

Is it any wonder that a writer like Olive Schreiner, remembering her own childhood's experience, should have written of it—'I loved Jesus, but I hated God' ?

The fatal objection to the Penal Satisfaction Theory which came into prominence in the Reformation period is that, while it makes great use of forensic metaphors, it imputes to the Judge of all the earth what every court of law in a civilized country would scout as the highest injustice.

The Governmental Theory avoids this difficulty by maintaining that the expiation offered by our Lord to the Divine Majesty, is not legal penal substitution, but an act of equal moral value to the punishment of the actual offender. But the treatment of the whole matter by Grotius is too juristic to cover the whole reality of the case. Surely sin is something far more than want of conformity to the law of a judge. It is revolt against and hatred of a Father. Acceptance of the Fatherhood of God as the determining principle of theology, must carry with it transformation of the Governmental theory.

Personally, therefore, I would start with the Moral Theory. The New Testament, as I have said, nowhere asserts that Christ reconciled God to man (which would inevitably imply always that fatal moral dualism between the First and Second Persons of the Trinity, of which I have spoken), which leads inevitably to practical polytheism. This is one of the great advances which the Moral Theory has made and must on no account be compromised, for with it would go not only the Unity of the Godhead but also the revelation value of Jesus Christ. It is absolutely vital to Christian faith that 'he that has seen the Son has seen the Father.'

To this end we must hold that everything, every emotion or judgment of value made by Christ regarding man and his condition, was inspired directly by the Father Himself. If it was not inspired by the Father, who inspired it ? And, indeed, the *Kenosis* and self-limitation of Christ implies that if the human Jesus was pure, yet merciful to His brethren, the greater Father was even more gracious. Did not Jesus Christ Himself say 'None is good save One' ?

We must then, I think, start from this point that Christ by His Cross changed the hearts of men toward God by this moving revelation of the grace of God to 'mankind sinners as such.' It will be noted that this is the common element in all the five theories. His atoning work was thus supremely one of *Revelation* of that which is the glory of the Bible, the Grace of God. That this is the main element in His Work of Reconciliation, I believe. But is it the whole ? In that case the Cross would simply be the announcement of the forgiving Love of God to all Mankind, a simple continuance and climax of the Incarnation. But can we dispose so lightly of human sin ? Does the Cross contain no message about human sin except this, that God forgives it, that is to say, treats it as if it does not exist, 'covers' it, to use the old Hebrew term ?

If that were all what would the Cross have to say to the man like Heine, who after an unedifying life says cheerfully, 'The Good God will forgive me. That is His job.' What would have happened if the Prodigal Son had come back laughing to his home ? Can we suppose that God simply ignores sin ? If that is so is there not a deep danger that man will ignore it too, in receiving the forgiveness of God ? Has God's justice *nothing* to say in the matter ? Is the sense of guilt, as well as imperfection, in the sinner, a merely subjective illusion, as Ritschl would apparently imply ? And to come, too, close to the central point, can any ethical Monotheism dispense with the idea of judgment to come ?

If the universe is a moral order, and surely all

coherent Monotheism implies that it is, must it not react upon those who are persistently impenitent? In considerations like these, the Mediæval, the Reformation, and the Governmental theories find their justification, and it is here that the moral influence theories are inadequate. The purely moral theories have, moreover, to reckon with the fact that the Apostolic writers, and in particular St. Paul, do often use forensic language in speaking of the death of Christ. It is difficult to reconcile such passages with a purely Moral Theory of the Atonement, that is to say, with one which regards it as simply a revelation of the forgiving *grace* of God. So much is this the case that either we find supporters of the theory endeavouring by rather unconvincing exegesis to explain away these passages, or, like Stevens or Rashdall, simply admitting them as exegetically undeniable but dismissing them as doctrinally authoritative. I agree with Dr. Denney who said that 'if primitive historical Christianity must always be essentially normative, and if later types of religion so diverge from the primitive type as to find the New Testament rather an embarrassment than an inspiration, the question they raise is whether they can any longer be recognized as Christian' (*The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, 26f.). Either way seems to me unsatisfactory. The rest of this article is an endeavour to sketch a development of the Moral Theory which may meet these difficulties. I would call the view I would endeavour to set before you in outline a *revelatory* theory of the Atonement.

By way of introduction to a positive statement, we may consider again the New Testament data, and in particular the Pauline testimony. In order really to understand St. Paul's great sayings about the Atonement we have to go into their background in Hebrew and Jewish literature. In speaking of the death of Christ he draws for the most part either on the imagery of the Jewish Apocalypses, and in particular of the Last Judgment, which is a purely forensic conception, or on the sacrificial system of his people. A few words of explanation are necessary to explain these two ideas.

I. *Apocalyptic Imagery.* It is generally agreed that the great achievement of the Hebrew people was its ethical Monotheism. That the Sovereign behind all things and all men, the Sovereign Power over all, was revealed in the moral ideal within us, was indeed a most precious revelation. It is, I think, becoming ever increasingly clear that the weakening and loss of this faith is at the root of the disintegration of the world to-day. What it meant to the Hebrew race is movingly expressed alike in the Prophets and the Psalms. Typical of this supreme discovery of God is the saying of Jeremiah: 'Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord' ($9^{23f.}$). But as time went on out of the very heart of this discovery two new difficulties emerged. (*a*) The only God worth believing in was the absolutely pure and perfect God. The earlier prophets had made it impossible for devout Israel to be content with any other than Him 'who was of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.' Man's moral nature demanded it. But his religious nature demanded communion with God. But how could they who knew themselves to be sinful and impure hold communion with this sovereign pure and perfect One, the sinner with the Holy One? Such communion might have been possible with the God of the period before the prophets when men in more prosperous and less exacting days could share more easily in the spontaneous worship of the tribal divinity, but now it was a harder matter. So the anxious Pharisee legalism crept in, man endeavouring in vain to keep the ever expanding requirements of the Law of God.

(*b*) The other difficulty was that the outward history belied the inward faith. The world in which Judaism lived was not the kind of world that one would expect if its Sovereign ruler were pure and just and good. It was a world in which the gods of Assyria or Persia, or the gods of the successors of Alexander, or the gods of Rome seemed to be triumphant. Faith saved itself by drawing out of the prophetic revelation of God the inevitable inference of a coming Judgment Day in which all nations should be summoned to the dread tribunal of Him whom they had scorned. Jeremiah draws this inference indeed in the verses immediately following those just quoted. Out of these conceptions sprang that whole weird apocalyptic literature of the Jewish people with whose pictures of Judgment to come the whole religious life of the period in which our Lord appeared, was saturated. At first this conception was of a judgment of the Gentile nations alone, but inevitably in time it became a judgment of all flesh, Jew as well as Gentile. Every devout Israelite believed that he too would stand before that judgment seat. 'And if the righteous could scarcely be saved, where would the ungodly and the sinner appear?'

This, too, formed a most formidable barrier to any true and filial communion with God. How could the sinner commune with his future Judge?

These, I take it, were the two great barriers which St. Paul had struggled in vain to cross before he met the Risen Lord outside Damascus. Through Him he crossed them both, for (1) in the Risen Christ he met God Himself in all His Purity and moral Perfection, knowing all about him, and yet approaching him in compassionate and abounding grace, and (2) in Christ's death he discerned a marvellous event which was far more than an equivalent for the Last Judgment, *which, in a word, made the Judgment morally superfluous for all who stood in the shadow of the Cross.* Henceforward, therefore, he knew himself to be a 'justified,' that is to say, an acquitted, that is to say, a forgiven man. This is the origin of all the forensic language which he uses about the work of Christ. It is taken over from the apocalyptic and forensic conceptions of Judaism.

(*To be continued.*)

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

True? New? You?

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

Once I was talking with a missionary about his work in India. He told me that in the beginning Hindus used to say, when he told the story of Jesus, 'It isn't true.' After some time they said, 'It may be true; but it isn't new.' Now they are saying, 'It may be true, and it may be new, but it isn't you.'

Others besides Hindus have said these things; the first two are easy to answer, the third is not so easy to answer. Let us look at them.

'It isn't *true*.' Many have said that about the story of Jesus and His gospel. It was the first and easiest thing to say. The leaders of the Jews said, when the disciples preached that Jesus was risen from the dead, that the disciples had stolen the body of Jesus and pretended that He was risen. They forgot that they had set a guard to make sure that couldn't happen! But it soon became impossible to say that, for it became plain that Jesus was not only alive but working in the lives of Christian men and women. It's no longer possible to say about the story of Jesus, 'It isn't true.' No story has been so searched out and tested, and the more it is examined the more the truth of it stands out. Two men once set out to prove it untrue: one took the story of the Resurrection and the other the story of the conversion of St. Paul, and both were honestly anxious to find out the truth. After a year of study they met to compare notes. One said, 'I have studied the Resurrection story and I am compelled to believe it is true.' The other said, 'I have studied the story of St. Paul's conversion, and I am compelled to believe it is true.' Jesus said, 'Seek and ye shall find'; they sought and found—that it was true. Nobody now says it isn't true: for nothing is more certain than that Jesus lived and died and rose again and is alive for evermore.

'It isn't *new*.' There is some truth in that. It would be foolish as well as untrue to say everything that Jesus said was new and that He never said anything that had ever been said before. Of course He did. He loved the Old Testament and quoted it. God never left the world in darkness: He had not only His prophets in Palestine but wise and good men everywhere who had their glimpses of God and spoke wise and true words. But when you have selected the best of this teacher and the best of others and made up something not unlike the teaching of Jesus, you find these things *all together* in His teaching and a great deal more besides. He was like the wise householder in His own parable who brought out of his treasure 'things new and old.' Jesus did say things that had been said before, and usually said them better; but He also said many things nobody had ever said before.

In the beginning nobody said, 'This isn't new.' They said it *was* new; 'What new doctrine is this?'—and Jesus was crucified for preaching new doctrines. The most original thing about Jesus was Himself. He was what He preached, and He preached Himself. Other teachers had said, 'That is the way'; Jesus said, 'I am the way, and the living truth.' Many had taught truth: Jesus not

only taught truth, He was the truth. He not only had words of eternal life: He was the living word. That was new.

So it is easy to answer when people say of the gospel of Christ, 'It isn't true' or 'It isn't new'; but it is by no means easy to find an answer when they say, 'It isn't *you*.' At His trial Jesus was asked about His disciples, and He said nothing. What was there to say? One was standing silent at the back of the hall; one was denying Him in the courtyard; and the rest had run away.

The biggest hindrance to Christ's kingdom in this world is not bad men and women, but unworthy Christians. The only thing that will win the world for Christ is Christian lives that live His words and breathe His spirit. For the world can't see Christ; it can only see Christians. And so long as it can say, 'It's true, and it's new, but it *isn't you*,' it will not want to see Christ.

Let us see to it that our lives reflect Christ truly to men, so that, seeing the reflection, they must want to seek and find the reality—Jesus Himself.

Put Your Foot Down.

By the Reverend Arthur J. Hichens, Higher Compton, Plymouth.

'He speaketh with his feet.'—Pr 6^{13}.

When we go to the cinema we not only see moving pictures of men and women, but we also hear their voices—although not so very long ago we could not do that, and the dialogue was shown on the screen. The pictures were silent then. Now we call them 'talkies.' One of the funniest, indeed perhaps he was the funniest of all comedians on the films, was Charlie Chaplin. Children used to scream with laughter as they watched his antics. But when men were clever enough to reproduce the voices as well as the movements of actors, Charlie Chaplin refused to allow his voice to be reproduced. And for a very good reason. He knew he could talk better with his feet! You had only to watch him strutting along with his cane, and you were bound to laugh. He did not need to utter a single word. He spoke with his feet.

You may have been to football matches. There you can always hear the voices of the crowd. Sometimes a stout gentleman, sitting in the stand, will shout: 'Play up, George. Give it to them, George!' He talks with his lips, but this kind of speech makes no difference to the result of the game. The members of the team have to speak with their feet. If they can cleverly pass the ball one to another, and if they can manipulate it so that one player can kick it into the goal, then they have spoken very eloquently indeed, without even opening their mouths.

Some time ago, at a certain musical competition, the prize was awarded to a singer who had not pleased the audience very much. They thought that another soloist was more deserving of the award, and so, when the result was announced they expressed their disapproval by stamping upon the floor. Hundreds of them did it at the same time! They were very angry and they made a great noise. They talked with their feet, and it was a very expressive language!

I once heard a mother, whose children had been somewhat difficult, say: 'It's time I put my foot down.' That sounds strange, doesn't it? But I'm sure you know what she meant. She certainly meant to do something!

There is an old song which says:

> There ain't no sense
> Sitting on a fence.

When we say that a man is sitting on the fence we usually mean that he hasn't the courage to show us where he stands. You can't put your foot down when you are sitting on a fence, can you? The man who sits on the fence waits to see which side other people are on. He wants to make sure 'which way the wind is blowing.' While he sits he has the power to come down on either side, whichever may prove popular.

If we learn to love Jesus we shall never sit on the fence. We shall stand firmly for all that He teaches us is right. We shall possess the courage to say 'No' to temptation. And when others talk or act in a way which we know He would think wrong, then we shall speak effectively with our feet. We shall put our feet down.

The Christian Year.

Twenty-First Sunday after Trinity.

Fear and its Cure.

'Nothing shall separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.'—Ro 8^{39}.

In the days of Jesus (and to this day indeed, amongst millions in Africa and China) belief in malignant, unseen spirits filled the hearts of men with darkness and terror. Their menace was an ever-present and terrifying reality, and so the ringing reassurance that the Christian message gave them made an irresistible appeal. God is

love—that is the Christian message that swept from the hearts of men the terror of demons and evil spirits. 'One of the reasons,' says a writer, 'that Christianity has lost some of its appeal is just that it has done its work so well.'

But if that particular fear has gone others remain. Fear is a hydra-headed monster, and with the recent waning of the sense of God it has increased its power over the hearts of men. In one form or another it is still one of the deadliest devastators of men's strength and peace. Take ourselves. Scarcely a month passes in the lives of some of us without a dread of some kind gnawing at our hearts. Fear about health or the security of one's place and job, about friends, children, fear about our ability to do certain things, our strength to carry out certain duties, fear of what others will say or do, fear of poverty or unpopularity or old age, fear of a friendship drying up or love declining, of accident and death—but it is impossible to mention a fraction of the things that are casting dark shadows of fear over the hearts of men. 'Fear hath torment,' wrote John, and we have known that his word is not too strong. It is a clearly recognized cause of physical sickness and disease. Doctors call many nervous troubles phobias, and *phobia* is the Greek for fear. Fear is the root of them. In our daily life fear destroys vital energy and takes the heart out of people. It is still one of the most disabling, disheartening, and deadly powers in the life of the world.

And so Christianity ought still to make an irresistible appeal as in the days of Paul, for still it is the way of deliverance from this bondage. And Jesus is the standard of Christianity. Look to Him and you will see one who had entirely conquered fear and who was constantly concerned to drive it out of others. He was tested in all points like as we are, but the violence of Nature never made Him afraid, nor poverty, nor suffering, nor the bigness of His task, nor any situation in which we ever see Him. When J. M. Barrie spoke to the students in St. Andrews, he told them that the staff they would need most for their journey through life was the staff of courage. His theme was courage. 'There is nothing else much worth speaking about, he said, 'to undergraduates or graduates, or white-haired men and women.' It is the lovely virtue: we cannot make anything of life without it. Jesus seemed to feel that too, if we are to judge by the many times He said to men, 'Fear not,' 'Be of good cheer,' 'Take courage.' Unlike others, that was not all He said. Merely to say that just irritates us. But He gives us the secret of His own poise before the disconcerting facts of life. What was it?

He was persuaded that nothing in life or death, nothing in the whole universe could separate Him from the love of God. He *knew* that God is in control and that nothing happens unless God permits it. He *knew* that God is perfect wisdom, perfect love, and that as long as He was doing God's will the almighty love of God encompassed Him. How did He confront His tremendous task? With this attitude—is anything too hard for God? God was with Him. His resources were infinite. The Gospels make it crystal clear that God was the secret of our Lord's quietness and confidence, and He saves us from fear by quickening in us the same faith. 'Why are you afraid like this?' He said to the disciples on the lake. 'Have you no faith yet?' 'Don't be afraid,' He said to Jairus, 'only believe and all will be well.' Faith is His cure for fear. There is no other real cure.

We try other cures, of course. For example, we sometimes reason with ourselves or others reason with us. We or our friends try to argue our fears down, by turning on them the light of common sense or of past experience. But we can no more be argued out of some of our dreads than a child can be argued out of his fear of the dark. Again, we may try to banish fear by an act of will. I'm not going to be afraid, we say, and let me point out that this can be the highest form of courage. It's a great victory of the spirit to force ourselves to face things that scare us stiff. But we *are* scared stiff. Both reason and will can be of some service in the fight against it, but neither can exorcise it.

And here is the reason. Fear does not belong to the thinking and the willing part of us so much as to the emotions and the imagination, and it has to be fought and conquered on its own ground. It can only be overcome by another emotion; by a different imagination. One of the outstanding discoveries of modern psychology is the power of the imagination in our daily living. It is commonly far more effective than either reason or will in controlling or changing the current of our feelings. You suggest to yourself something dreadful, and fear springs to life in you. Or you have some difficult task to perform and your imagination runs ahead and suggests to you that you will make a mess of it, that you will collapse, and it is with a collapsed heart that you approach it. Most of our fears, psychology tells us, are begotten in the same way, by wrong and unbelieving imaginings, and they can only be conquered by true and believing suggestions to the imagination.

Now what faith does is to create in our imagination those true and believing suggestions. It whispers to us, 'God is your God, your Father, from whose love nothing can separate you; so long as you do His will there is nothing to fear. He will never leave you, never let you down. Studdert Kennedy tells us that when he first got out to the front line he was paralysed by fear. He tried to reason himself out of it. He told himself that he was a Christian chaplain and an officer, and more than any one else ought to show a good example. But telling himself things like that did not make him less afraid. And then he told himself other things. He stirred up within himself the gift of faith. He was, he believed, where God wanted him to be, doing his God-given duty. And then he found that God was with him. Between him and all the horrors he set the shield of the love of God. That did it. Fear died. He had fought and conquered it on its own ground.

One may be in the grip of the fears that sin breeds. He may, in Coleridge's words, be

> Like one, that on a lonesome road
> Doth walk in fear and dread,
> And having once turned round walks on,
> And turns no more his head;
> Because he knows, a frightful fiend
> Doth close behind him tread.

Fear of the judgment of God, still more acute, fear of being found out and of the judgment of man, fear of consequences—sin is fertile in such fears; but it was one in their bitter bondage to whom Jesus said, 'Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.' God loves you no matter what you have done. He doesn't promise to take away all the consequences—forgiveness doesn't just mean being let off—but commit yourself to Him and He will help you to face them; He will redeem that past for you. Or again, we may be confronting some trying experience, some difficult responsibility, some duty that seems beyond our strength. 'Why does it have to be me?' we tend to think. *That's a wrong thought. Think this.* God has asked us to do that for Him. We did not seek it. It's not our choice. No, it's God's. He is giving us a chance to do something really big and worth while for other people, that is to say, for Him. He is dealing with us as a Commander does with his best men in the war—putting us in a danger post. Fear is whimpering in our heart. 'We cannot do what we ought to do.' Drown it with the voice of faith that says, 'you can, with the help of God.' Nothing can separate you from His love. Fear must be fought and conquered on its own ground, and only faith can do it.[1]

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Debt of the Forgiven.

BY THE REVEREND A. D. HARCUS, M.A.,
EALING, LONDON.

'And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.' —Mt 6^{12}.

The Gospels make very clear that there is a relationship between divine and human forgiveness. The petition for forgiveness is the first to have a condition attached to it. Many references could be quoted to confirm this; sufficient for our purpose is the parable of the king who forgave his servant the debt of ten thousand talents which follows with its telling sequel of how the same servant refused to forgive a fellow-servant a trifling debt of one hundred pence. That passage is a proof of the relationship between divine and human forgiveness, and indicates its vital importance in the mind of our Lord.

The first reaction to the condition is that it is reasonable. It is reasonable because it can be fulfilled. Supposing the condition had been applied earlier in the prayer, to such petitions as, 'Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done,' would that have been fair? To some extent, yes. We can give God a kingdom in our hearts and seek His will in our own actions. But in the main these are big issues far beyond our control and the emphasis of the petition undoubtedly is on the action and power of God. The same applies to the request for daily bread. We can and do give to others, but our powers are strictly limited. How often the wish comes for the means to do more. It is easy to provide a meal for a stray wanderer, but how to provide for a friend of middle age who has lost his post and has a home to maintain, that is the haunting problem. Who has escaped it even in peaceful days? And now with heart-gripping stories of want and need everywhere our power of response seems pitifully inadequate. If the prayer for daily bread was dependent on our ability to answer the material needs of others, then indeed the condition would be unreasonable. And therefore we are taught to pray in simple faith and without condition, 'Give us this day our daily bread.'

On the other hand, forgiveness seems to be in our power, to give or to withhold. It is not limited by a special time or place, or by any set of conditions

[1] J. K. Thomson, *I Have Kept the Faith*, 53.

beyond our own sphere. It is of a man's own will whether he forgives or no. It is significant that freedom should come at the highest point in life. Man is bound materially in so many ways, the world imposes its will and binds him down. But there is an escape, there is a freedom the world cannot interfere with. Materially it may happen that one cannot give bread, but forgiveness is always within one's power. And so just at this point of freedom the condition is applied. We cannot control the forces of Nature; national and international issues are beyond our immediate control, but forgiveness is something which concerns ourselves, to be given or withheld of our own free will. And therefore we are taught to pray, 'Forgive—as we forgive.'

So far then the theory, but the plain facts of the situation contradict the theory. How many would say in answer, 'I can give bread and I do, but I cannot forgive. It is not anger. That has gone and the bitterness is past, but I simply cannot forgive.' The truth is, and it seems a paradox, that while in the material world we are bound by necessity and in the spiritual world we are free, yet, as a matter of experience, we can act in the one case but in the other our spirits are bound by a power seemingly far stronger than any material necessity. If forgiveness is dependent on our ability to forgive then we reach a deadlock; and life is full of these deadlocks.

Is there a solution to the problem? Let it be said straight away there is such a thing as an unforgiving spirit. And that must be exorcised. It may be that in a certain instance we do not want to forgive, indeed we have no intention of doing so; that chapter is closed. And so in and through the life of the community there are these negations, these refusals. They must be faced with a human willingness to reconsider. That is the challenge of this prayer, to set our own house in order. And there is always something we can do ourselves. But that is not the complete answer, it is only the beginning of the answer. And here an examination of the Gospel material will help. So far as our share in the process of forgiveness is concerned it may be past, present, or future. In St. Matthew's account of the prayer, it reads, 'And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.' At this point the condition is applied with all its rigour. Self-examination and a putting of things right, before God can be approached. The prayer in St. Luke reads, 'And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us.' Are we in danger of over-emphasis if we stress the present tense? Experience justifies it and especially the experience of worship. How often that which could not be done beforehand, in cold blood, becomes possible, easy, nay, inevitable in the warmth and glow of Christian worship. The prayer and the fulfilling of the condition are simultaneous.

And yet there remains a deadlock, obstinate even in worship, even though there is a human longing to be rid of it, to break it down. What then? The past and present have failed, there is still the future. Is there Gospel evidence for this? It is found in the parable of the king who forgave his servant a debt. (Reference was made to this parable at the outset and now its lesson can be made clear.) In this case the forgiveness was unconditional. True there was a sequel, but that does not alter the fact that the debt was at the time freely forgiven. The part the servant had to play was in the future. There was no question of a human decision to be made first and then a prayer for forgiveness; it was not even to be a simultaneous cancelling out. It was a free gift. And what a gift! Ten thousand talents was the sum involved, an amount almost beyond calculation. As if God was determined to act first, for we can now leave the story. It has served its purpose in bringing us face to face with the Cross itself. There is God's free gift, beyond calculation, His determined effort to end the deadlock. 'The Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me,' writes St. Paul, and Chrysostom in a well-known quotation remarks of this that the Apostle is appropriating to himself the love which belongs equally to the whole world. In other words, it is the whole love of God in Christ which is brought to bear upon each individual heart. That is God's way of dealing with this apparently insoluble problem of forgiveness. When it is quite beyond our power and will, then He acts and acts decisively.

Forgiveness from our point of view can thus be described as having three tenses—past, present, and future. Each has its own place in our lives and in each we have a part to play. The whole can be summed up in a penetrating remark of Professor Manson's to be found in his Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel. Of this petition in the Lord's Prayer he writes, 'The gifts of God can only flow to us as we become the channel for them to others.' In other words, it is a process which we can hinder or even for the time being, stop. Like a man whose farm is a part of a great irrigation scheme, he can stop the water coming in to refresh his own land. But the pipes are there and the reservoir remains

in being. And there is the possibility that at some time he himself will open the barrier, and there is the chance that the waters in their downward rush from the reservoir will break his barrier down. Illustrations from the material world cannot adequately describe spiritual mysteries, but if we grasp this idea of forgiveness as a process we may begin to understand our part in it. What is certain is the existence of the reservoir of love and mercy that makes all forgiveness possible, and that we are the recipients and the channels of this abounding Grace of God. And the two truths are linked together in our daily prayer—forgive as we forgive.

Twenty-third Sunday after Trinity.

The Frivolous Refusal.

'But they made light of it.'—Mt 22^5.

The condemnation of the men who refused the invitation to the marriage feast was not that they were discourteous, but that they had proved themselves unworthy. They were not only disinclined to come to the feast, but they had shown that they were not *fit* to come; they not only refused the invitation of the king, they scorned it. 'They made light of it.'

An important element in the art of living is knowledge of the relative value of thinking, the right order and due precedence of the many appeals that continually knock at the door. There is no ordered movement, no development of the life, unless we determine that which must have precedence. There are some things we must make light of; a grain of humour and insight is necessary to help us to see things in their right proportions and shapes. Without this we are apt to follow the trivial with all seriousness, and to treat the important with frivolity. As far as we can gather from the parable, and judge from the wrath and condemnation of the king, these men had not seriously weighed the claim of their farms and their merchandise against the claims of the king's hospitality. Had they done this, we might have blamed them for an error in judgment, and for a false estimate of the value of things, but no more. Their condemnation is that they never seem to have *felt* any claim whatever save the claim of farm and merchandise.

When we remember that Jesus painted this picture in order to illustrate the attitude of some to the claims of God this attitude becomes very significant in its possible reference to ourselves. While we are compelled to admit the reality of the difficulties which keep some of us from entering the Kingdom, we are compelled also to add that it is the lack of serious attempt to give the call of the King its due weight that accounts for more. There is great hope for the man who seriously weighs the call of God, but who for the time being is not convinced, or for some reason does not feel free to become a Christian. The danger in his case is lest the decision be delayed until the desire is weakened and the call becomes faint. But what save the strongest condemnation can be meted out to the type of man who *flouts* the call of God? What can be said for the man who scorns the appeal of the highest, who makes light of the best? There is hope for the man who turns away from the higher, overcome by the appeals of the lower, but what hope is there for the man who coolly and deliberately makes light of the best when it is clear before him?

Why did these men treat the king's invitation in this manner? The answer is contained in the story. They were prosperous men; they had farms and merchandise. They were akin to the man with big barns. *They had no need of a gospel.* They were so impressed with the things they had, that they felt no higher needs. How strange the Beatitudes must sound in the ears of the men who are satisfied with the things of this world! Only those who have lost can catch the full music in the word 'Resurrection.' Only those who are in the grip of sin, or remorse for sin, can hear aright the word 'Forgiveness.' Only the heavy-hearted and the heavy-burdened can value aright the words of Jesus when He said, 'Come unto me, all ye that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' These men had paid a big price for their farms and their merchandise. They had obtained them at the price of a soul that could treat God with impunity, that could scorn the highest with a laugh, that could 'make light of' the call of their King.

We must not confuse frivolity with light-heartedness or buoyancy of spirit. The Pharisees were solemn and yet they were petty and flippant. A laugh and a light-hearted manner may cover a great seriousness of purpose and dignity of outlook. What would be the result if we treated the serious calls of business and of our social and civic life with the essential flippancy with which we treat the great issues of the gospel? Would not our business be ruined and our best friendships sundered if we treated men as we treat God? We should suffer irretrievably if we thus handled the affairs of this life, and can we think that we shall not suffer and have to pay for the trivial consideration we give

and the frivolous attitude we adopt towards spiritual things?

We should have a serious outlook on life as a whole. A careless indifference does not profit us either in temporal or spiritual matters; rather, it ruins and blights wherever it is the characteristic attitude of the man. Is not one of the crying needs of our age the need to recover the high seriousness of our fathers? In doing so we need not cover ourselves in gloom as with a garment, but we cannot live life worthily or well without true seriousness of purpose. This is an age in which we are trying to improve social conditions, to lighten the lot of the oppressed everywhere, but we cannot do this by making life itself a light affair, by developing a hatred of all restraint and of the discipline that is necessary for the truest well-being both of men and nations.

What cheer and joy Jesus brought to men! Yet with what high seriousness did He regard the world and men, Himself and His work. We can understand a pagan treating life flippantly, but not a man who regards life in its relationship to Eternity as we have to do since Jesus came. He lifted life from the trivial and linked it to the ages and the purposes of God. God regards the life we live seriously, and dare we then quietly put aside the call of God to our souls? We must give an answer to the invitation.

May God give us that high seriousness of mind which weighs well the calls that come to us, and that cannot make light of wrong things. May He save us from that frivolity that desecrates all it touches, and ever means ruin and death.[1]

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Prayer in War Time.

BY THE REVEREND A. H. SELWAY, M.A.,
URMSTON, MANCHESTER.

'In every thing by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God.'—Ph 4^6.

Twice this year it has been by the express desire of the King that we have observed a Day of National Prayer. Some may say that to observe a Day of National Prayer is inadvisable, but the reasons given are not very convincing. Let us not forget that a Day of National Prayer in the Old Testament (for a Day of National Prayer is not something new) was a day of national repentance and dedication of a cause to God.

[1] A. Hird, *The Test of Discipleship*, 100.

A great deal of mental confusion can be created by those who claim that it is wrong for a nation to dedicate its cause to God, because, as is sometimes said, all nations are doing the same thing. The implied suggestion is that God is no respecter of persons or nations, and that in any case it is presumptuous to suppose that God answers prayers which mutually cancel or contradict one another. But these deductions are not always sound. We may be quite certain that our prayers will be answered in the degree to which we are ourselves in right relationship with God. Our faith does not tell us that Providence is on our side, nor does it tell us that right will win every battle against might, but that right will nevertheless win, because justice, truth, and goodness are eternal values. If it is true that we champion these values we are right to believe that God is on our side. We know, too, that the nation or nations who are dedicated to this great cause of truth, justice, and goodness are destined to become the nucleus of the Kingdom of God on earth.

The question is well worth asking: Are we worthy of this high cause? Can we honestly pray that we should be granted victory? The Dean of St. Paul's said a year ago in a Broadcast Sermon: 'We are up against bullies and tyrants and liars and people deceived by foolish imaginations. Our first victory is to overcome the tyrant and the bully and the fool and the liar in ourselves. We must kill them in our own souls; or rather we must lay them before God and say, "Lord I repent; I am not worthy to fight for the good; slay for me the evil in my heart."'

Our sin does 'turn away God's face from us.' He cannot do for us and in us what He fain would do. But that does not mean that God abandons us. The father did not say to the prodigal son, 'Well, I've done with you, you've made a mess of your life, and now nothing can be done for you.' We know what the father did. He ran out to meet him. It is indeed beyond our comprehension to understand what it must mean to God to be Father of this great wayward European family. However, one thing is certain, God has not abandoned us to the powers of evil. We can continue to pray 'out of the deep' into which the common sin has plunged us. Some of us are so used to the service of our Church that the constant repetition of the responses has dulled their significance and our imagination. Thus the sentence, 'Give peace in our time, O Lord,' provides the response, 'Because there is none other that fighteth for us, but only thou, O God.' Despite the fact that we have made

this affirmation a good many thousand times, yet we thought there were some others. Many of us put our faith in the League of Nations, others in Collective Security, and others in the Maginot Line. Now we know that these have failed us. In a vague and conventional way we were comforting ourselves with the thought that God was with us, but our security was a false one. We said that the ideals we stood for were just ones. We claimed to be the champions of democracy and the self-determination of all nations, but we had almost left God out of count. We as a nation were turning our backs on our Father's home. Eighty per cent average of our whole nation gave no public homage or allegiance to Almighty God.

War is terrible and horrible, but it is the manifestation of deeper evils in our common life, and what lies behind the war is worse than war. That is one reason why we are not justified in praying for victory unless we are willing to face up to the challenge to repentance. And repentance for our ineffectiveness will not be achieved either by resolution or a resolution. 'It will happen, it will eventuate as a result of the way in which we become conscious of our weakness.'

How often have we prayed that 'the course of this world may be peaceably ordered,' but have we stopped to consider what this means? At least it means that we invite God into our lives so that we may see the folly of our sin and pride; so that we may acknowledge our responsibility for the present world conflict, not in a mood of panic and gloom, but rather in a spirit of firm resolve and determination to pay the price for our folly and our sin with humility and penitence. We are under judgment, and one may ask: 'What for?' Chiefly for the neglect of God. Or as the Archbishop of York has expressed it: 'We have not as a people put Him first or sought to regulate all our dealings by His law. We have yielded to the temptations offered by hitherto unparalleled opportunities of comfort. Is it not true that most of these present evils are directly due to our unwillingness for sacrifice of ease and comfort? . . . We have not worked out in our national life the principle of dedication to the high purposes entrusted to us by the Providence of God.' 'Our prayer must be a dedication of all we have and are to meet the needs of our nation at this time, and to serve God's cause now and always.' We are not fighting for Christianity, for Christianity forbids us to do so. And there is a sense in saying that we are not fighting to save modern civilization, because modern civilization is not Christian. But the thing we are fighting for is the fundamental liberties without which civilization is impossible. 'We are not fighting for religion, but we are fighting for something that our religion recognizes to be worth fighting for.' The winning of this war and the overthrowing of the dreadful tyranny of lies and cruelty is the first step, and let none of us delude ourselves with any doubts as to its necessity. But the call of God to us to-day goes deeper than that. We must be willing to be used as the instrument of God's justice and the deeper works of mercy. God calls for absolute obedience. The Church in her prayer life must accept this calling and lead and encourage others into obedience to it; to make men awake and responsive to that call. We must long with an urgent longing that at the earliest possible moment we may become again the instruments of the Divine mercy. We must not allow anger or wrath to darken our vision that God is Lord of all the nations of the earth, and as He calls us He calls all nations to obey a single law of love and justice. The forgiveness of Christ can break through the dark clouds of evil and bring hope and life eternal to the wounded heart of humanity.

'Almighty and everlasting God who alone workest great marvels: Send down upon our Bishops, and Clergy, and all Congregations committed to their charge, the healthful spirit of thy grace; and that they may truly please thee, pour upon them the continual dew of thy blessing. . . .'

We need confidence towards God who is not powerless but who can, in and through us as a dedicated nation, bring salvation out of the very worst men can do.

Twenty-Fifth Sunday after Trinity.

'My Yoke.'

By the Reverend A. W. M'Clymont, D.Litt., Edinburgh.

'Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me.'—Mt 11^{29}.

In a great passage in the eighth chapter of Romans Paul describes with glowing words the new estate and the wonderful privileges of the Christian: 'Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear'; . . . 'if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ.'

Now the influence and gifts of Christianity have often been set out in general terms. Through the coming of our Lord mankind has been presented with a higher standard of righteousness, a wider

spirit of compassion, a more confident hope. But the words of Paul suggest that behind and within these gifts there is something more intimate and personal. What is offered to us is an inheritance. Accepting it we are heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. How frequently does Jesus use the possessive adjective; He speaks of 'my joy,' 'my peace,' 'my cup,' 'my body'; and when He speaks thus, He makes it clear that He desires to share with us, so far as that is possible, all that He owns. Rightly did Paul interpret the words and thought of Jesus when he spoke of believing men and women as 'joint-heirs with Christ.'

Let us consider that part of our heritage expressed in the words 'My Yoke.'

Perhaps you will think the words have a most unattractive air and a most unpromising sound—that not a gift but a task is presented to us, not a boon but a burden. But let us not be disappointed and break away without further thought. There is rich meaning and a genuine heritage in the words of our text.

First of all, we would acknowledge frankly that Christianity does mean *constraint*, a yoke. If you turn to any pictures of Eastern life you will see the oxen on the roads or in the fields dragging their load with a wooden bar resting on their necks. Paul himself in the Epistle to the Galatians speaks of the 'yoke of bondage,' while in the Old Testament the word is associated with the fate of captives in war and of slaves. And so there are many who will turn aside from the Christian way with resentment, declaring that for them a 'slave-religion' has no inducements, or more simply that there are restrictions enough imposed upon them that they cannot escape and they do not want any more. Bunyan with his shrewd knowledge of the human situation puts this very argument into the mouth of Diabolus when the evil one is seeking to weaken the morale of the citizens of Mansoul. Let us admit that there is a fact here which is capable of being used to the disadvantage of Christianity—and is largely used by the nations to-day—so that it is represented as a cramping influence that seems to make life poorer and narrower rather than freer and fuller. You may have heard, however, an old proverb, not so well known as many proverbs: 'He that will not be ruled by the rudder will be ruled by the rock.' The meaning is clear. If sailors are contemptuous of the steersman, they will give themselves up to a power that is contemptuous of them. Control and constraint are definite parts of life. The only question is concerning the nature of that control, whether it be 'the rock,' a power ruinous and unhappy, or 'the rudder,' a power directing us to our desired haven. Some scoff at the idea of subjection, yet they bow before the tyranny of fashion, wait obediently upon the opinions of the crowd and suffer the scourging of their own whims and moods. A false freedom attracts many. Is it anything more than slavery to caprice and surrender to prejudice? Edmund Burke, the orator, has a convincing reply when he said, 'Men of intemperate minds cannot be free; their passions forge their fetters.' And Shakespeare sets the issue in a clear light when he puts into the mouth of Macbeth a bold retort to the sneers of his wife, 'I dare do all that may become a man; who dares do more is none.'

Life requires direction, guidance to some end. It cannot continue to bring satisfaction or even continue at all, if suffered to be the plaything of any and every desire. Jesus says frankly, Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me. Why not join in the words of the prayer,

> Jesus, Saviour, pilot me
> Over life's tempestuous sea;
> Unknown waves before me roll,
> Hiding rock and treacherous shoal;
> Chart and compass come from Thee:
> Jesus, Saviour, pilot me.

Again, we may carry the thought further and say that the Yoke of Christ means *a career*.

I do not know if the stories of R. M. Ballantyne are still read, but they were great tales and I remember one about a horse, the leader of a herd that roamed the prairie, conspicuous for its grace and power. The hero sets his heart upon the capture of this magnificent animal and eventually succeeds in bowling it over. But this is the point, the horse enters into the story first as servant, then as friend. Its capture is the commencement of its wonderful career. If it had not been brought under the yoke, it would never have been heard of. By reason of its service it passes into a larger life.

Restlessness makes us long for wild, open freedom, untrammelled by the constraint of man, but we come to see sooner or later that such a life would be a mere frittering away of the portion given to us. Pass any school and out in the playground you will find groups of boys and girls happy and contented at their games, flinging up their heels with the exuberance of young life. We envy them their freedom, but when they come to fourteen, fifteen, sixteen years of age, how weary they are of this freedom and how eager to start some definite work,

to enter on a career. Now Christ in offering a yoke really invites us to a career. What is a career? It is work in which you may lose yourself and in which at the same time you may find yourself. It means a task into which you can throw all your energies and forget your troubles, something to live for, finding and maintaining your self-respect and building up, if not a fortune, certainly a character. The followers of Jesus have found just this satisfaction, a service worth pursuing and in its own way well-rewarded, so that St. Bernhard, the friend of St. Francis, can say, 'For a thousand worlds such as this, I would not have served another Master.' There are different kinds of Christian service, but wherever the spirit of Christ rules, there is a career. We have accepted His yoke.

Yet further, we find that a *Companion* joins Himself to us. It is 'my yoke' of which Jesus speaks, involving Himself directly in all that the phrase suggests. Is there constraint? That was part of His experience. In the early days He was subject to His parents. Later He walked solitary along the narrow path of duty. At the end He suffered shame and crucifixion. Yet along that path lay the shaping of His career, the carrying through of His vocation, and the thrill of an infinite satisfaction: 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me and to finish his work.' Limited certainly appeared the outward circumstances of Christ's life but limitless His hopes and purposes.

If Christian duty seems hard, if we have to admit the burden it imposes to be indeed a yoke, holding us inflexibly to our task, yet we share this burden, we have a Companion at our side. 'Remember,' says Matthew Henry, 'Christ's yoke is lined with love.' The fretting and restiveness that wound our hearts and weaken our spirit have found a cure. Casting aside our pride, let us learn and keep learning of Him, so that we do not hesitate or complain, but take our share of the duties and difficulties about us. Our generation has been called upon to attempt much and to endure much in the present struggle through wounds to a new world-order. In what spirit are we to go forward? Not Stoical submission to a fate we cannot escape, not the vigour of national pride, but the self-forgetting of those who look beyond the Cross to the Companion. From Him we may learn how responsibility brings its own rest. With Him we may carry our burden, and if our heart and faith be great enough we may help others on their way.

The Doctrine of Incarnation, Hindu and Christian.

By W. S. Urquhart, D.Litt., D.D., LL.D., Emeritus Principal of the Scottish Church College, Calcutta.

In the relating to one another of religious doctrines set forth in different faiths, we are not now exposed to the danger of forgetting that comparisons are odious. Rather is it that comparisons have become too easy, and this may be due to a certain superficiality of treatment. We achieve a facile identification and minimize points of difference simply because we are insufficiently aware of the vital importance of the doctrines under consideration. The more valuable a deposit the more likely is it that it will be secured by a lock which can be opened only through a combination approaching the unique. Thus, if we are to make any useful comparison between the Christian Incarnation doctrine and that of other religions, it is well to think, as Dr. Emil Brunner writes in his latest book, of 'the *central* doctrine of the Incarnation of God in Jesus Christ.' It is only by emphasizing its centrality for the Christian faith that we are likely to obtain a true criterion whereby we may estimate the adequacies of different views of Incarnation. When we know how much—how very much—we want, we are more likely to arrive at a true judgment of the value of what we receive.

We must therefore bring the Incarnation into the foreground of our thinking as well as of our acting. Because we wish to avoid the sin of over-confidence in human reason, there is no need for us to become philosophically diffident. We may hold firmly to the belief that the Incarnation supplies the only world-view which is philosophically, ethically, and religiously satisfying. As Mr. Middleton Murry puts it: 'In Jesus Christ was manifested the nature of the thought that created

and sustains the universe.' If we hold to the promise that the Holy Spirit is to lead us into all truth, the key-truth and the expanding truth to which we are led is the truth of the Incarnation. In the words of Gore, 'the speciality of the Pentecostal gift appears to be the coming of the Holy Spirit out of the uplifted and glorious manhood of the incarnate Son.' There is involved in this attitude the faith, humbly received as a Divine bestowal but also confidence-giving, that the Incarnate Christ, in relation to us now the Risen and glorified Christ, has honoured man's nature as a vehicle of the eternal Spirit of God, and intends that this nature should be honoured in its potentialities, not utterly condemned and despised because of its actualities. Christianity, through the Incarnation, is a promise from God for humanity, and for humanity as active in history. As Brunner says: 'Genuine Christian humanism is based upon the fact of the Incarnation of the Son of God, which, for its part, points back to the creation of man in the image of God. . . . Even sin does not alter the fact . . . that man is singled out by the Creator in an unparalleled way as the one in whom creation has reached its summit, whose redemption, therefore, is the aim and meaning of the whole of history' (*Man in Revolt*, 344).

In attempting to reach some understanding of the Christian doctrine of Incarnation we must avoid two errors—the suggestion on the one hand of what might be described as the absenteeism of God, and, on the other, of the absenteeism of man in any real significance of the term. A true appreciation of the Incarnation, which is the coming together of God and man—*Immanuel*, God with us—is impossible on any view which emphasizes unnecessarily the separateness of God from man or of man from God. It is impossible on a deistic view, which is already half way to atheism, which conceives of God as detached from the world, surrenders the latter to the control of secondary causes, and regards the Divine interposition in cosmic and human affairs as something which strains belief, is slightly derogatory to the wisdom of God and is, after all, only very occasional. A belief which can be an effective corrective to such an attitude must insist on placing the Incarnation within the general category of the miraculous, taking miraculous to mean, not spasmodic interference, but a manifestation of the active presence of God, continually in the world which He has made. God speaks the 'inevitable Word' in the situation which calls for it, and expresses that Word in action which is in the context of His constant purpose of love. As has been said, 'The Incarnation is the most consummate example of God's obedience to the laws of His own creation,' and these laws, being the laws of God Himself, do not impose fetters upon His free creative activity.

From the other extreme, a theology of the Barth-Brunner type empties the Incarnation of much of its meaning by introducing an unnecessary dualism. It is an underestimate, not, like deism, of the power of God, but of the possibilities of man. It so denigrates the capacity of humanity as to deprive the term 'man' of much of its significance, and it thus does not maintain distinctly in its thought the two elements of the relationship between God and man, in the constituting—or reconstituting—of which the meaning of the Incarnation essentially consists. It does not keep a sufficient continuity between the God of creation and the God of redemption. The error of humanism is to think that man can do without God. But, as Professor De Burgh puts it, 'Man can only realize the full measure of his birthright in virtue of his membership of the Kingdom of God,' and, 'if he would enter upon his kingdom, he must forego his right to be its king.' Yet it does not follow from this limitation and warning that because man, in the history of his religious development, has often aspired to kingship in his own right, we must, in order to avoid this sin of pride, degrade him utterly and make of him a worm and no man. On the Barthian conception even life seems at times to be denied him. The logical outcome of this view is that man is little more than an empty box with no capacity whatever except that of receptivity. It would be a pity if we should forget in this connexion the saying of older thinkers. Long ago Locke said, 'God when he made the prophet did not unmake the man,' and many centuries earlier an Old Testament prophet claimed confidently the fulfilment of the promise of God, 'Ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart' (Jer. 29^{13}).

Brunner's position seems more satisfactory than Barth's in that he links more closely the God of Redemption with the God of Creation, and specially emphasizes man's responsibility. But Brunner is obsessed with the idea of the dynamic. He will not allow that even God has a 'nature,' but insists that He is *actus purus*. Correspondingly, there can, for Brunner, be nothing static in man, nothing deposited or 'funded' in a derived capacity of human nature. His conception of creation thus becomes entirely vague and fluid. The same vagueness attaches to his fundamental idea that

the Incarnation is a continuance of creation, and his saying that 'human nature was originally destined for the reception of God' loses practically all its meaning.

In the context of the purely dynamic it is difficult to speak of 'original destination.' We seem to be deprived of a *locus* for the Incarnation. Further, seeing that no amount of theoretical denial of the static will alter the practical fact that we have to live within the actually existent or static, to which, we are told, God cannot be related, we are without escape from a bondage similar to that of materialism and naturalism, and our belief in the possibility of an Incarnation is all the more difficult.

There is a risk of consequences of a somewhat similar character in the masterly analysis which Professor Nygren gives in his book on *Eros and Agape*. He is so anxious to show that the Divine love is spontaneous or 'uncaused,' so unrelated to any merit in man, that he is in danger of depriving man of any definiteness as the object of that love, while the Divine love is left in such a state of uncausedness as to appear almost arbitrary.

On the basis of our discussion up to this point, it may be said that the value of Incarnation depends upon the closeness and fullness of the relationship which it establishes between God and man. More explicitly, the test of an Incarnation will be the fullness with which it exhibits the nature of God, and the amount of reality which is ascribed to the historical conditions under which the Incarnation takes place. But before considering these criteria further and making use of them as a basis of comparison, we may turn to certain doctrines of Incarnation which are to be found outside of Christianity.

If we believe in the centrality of Incarnation for the Christian faith (as indeed we must if we are Christians at all), it may startle us to discover how widespread is the belief in a doctrine of a somewhat similar character. But in entering upon comparisons it is necessary to make one or two distinctions. Incarnation is not the same as transmigration. In countries, where a belief in transmigration is prevalent, it is often loosely said that one soul is incarnated in several different lives, both human and animal. It would be better, however, not to apply the term 'incarnation' to the passing of one soul from one body to another, but to confine it to the incursion of the Divine into the human sphere. It is advisable also, especially in connexion with more primitive religions and for the benefit of anthropologists who are inclined to show their broadmindedness by minimizing the importance of the Christian Incarnation, to distinguish between incarnation and 'possession.' The latter term suggests indeed the incursion of the Divine into the human, but it is a purely temporary phenomenon, whereas incarnation is permanent or at least lasts during the lifetime of the individual manifesting it. Finally, especially in relation to Indian religions, we must always keep in mind the distinction between incarnation as the embodiment of an idea, and incarnation as a fact of history.

While it might be said that belief in Incarnation in some form or other is to be found in almost every religion, this doctrine is specially emphasized in India. Indeed the number of Incarnations in which Hindus think that they may believe is almost without limit. But certain groups of incarnations become prominent to the virtual exclusion of the others. The *Gītā*—one of the most influential religious books in India—deals with the incarnations of Krishna, and the following principle is laid down: 'Whenever there is a decay of righteousness and a rising of unrighteousness, then I emit myself. In order to save the good and destroy the evil-doers, I am born from age to age.' The incarnations of Vishnu, one of the most important of Indian gods, are conceived to be almost infinite in number, but gradually get restricted to a definite series. According to one doctrine, nine incarnations have already taken place, and the tenth, Kalki, is still in the future. In general, it might be said that the primary distinction of Hinduism from Christianity is that the former believes in repetition from age to age—repetition almost to the point of futility, whereas Christianity believes in an increasing purpose throughout the ages, preparatory to the 'once-for-all' Incarnation of Christ. As Principal Cave points out, Avatāra, which is the Hindu word for 'incarnation,' does not properly mean incarnation at all but simply 'descent,' and to translate it thus without qualification is 'to introduce into Hindu thought a conception which is purely Christian.' Yet, repetition notwithstanding, Hindus must not be thought of as incapable of genuine devotion to the particular 'descent' which they worship. One of the greatest of Indian Christian writers, as quoted by Principal Cave, could say, 'It was over the bridge of Tukārām's verse that I came to Christ'; and Tukārām was a devotee of Krishna. Indeed, the inherited tradition of devotion to any one out of a number of incarnations may become a temptation to Christian converts, as they are more ready simply to put Christ in the

place of one of the gods previously worshipped than to think of God as truly revealed through Christ.

In considering plurality of incarnations we must always remember that there are gradations of value amongst them. Even the same god may have a lower and a higher phase. The Krishna of the Purānas may be an incitement to degraded worship, whereas the Krishna of the *Gītā* has very high ethical significance. Incarnations may be graded according to whether they are merely naturalistic or ethical. Many incarnations serve only for the display of qualities attributed to God, but really resident merely in impressive natural phenomena. Others seem to serve the purpose of the strengthening of righteousness and the deliverance of demoralized humanity from the bondage of evil. The grading of incarnations is closely connected with considerations of the motive assigned for the incarnation. At lower levels the motive seems to be mainly display, the conception being coloured by experiences such as those of the behaviour of a mighty oriental monarch who on State occasions is in the habit of appearing in gorgeous raiment before his assembled people. Slightly higher are the motives of satisfying curiosity or showing merciful kindness. Still higher is the ethical motive, as indicated in the quotation given above from the *Gītā*. But in Hinduism the highest motive of all is rarely reached—the motive of redemption, congruent with Lotze's idea that God's motive even n creation is to share His holiness with His creatures, and deepening in Christianity into the doctrine of a sharing which is not inevitable or facile, but spontaneous, taking the way of suffering even unto death—the fundamental Christian motif of love in which God restores to demoralized humanity the lost capacity of participating in that holiness which God desires to share with all men.

If, after comparison with other faiths, our belief in the supreme value of the Christian Incarnation is strengthened, it will be because, as already suggested, it satisfies in the completest way two criteria—the degree of fullness with which the Incarnation manifests the nature of God, and, secondly, the amount of reality which is ascribed to the actual conditions, with their historical context, in which the Incarnation takes place. These two criteria are not distinct, as our conception of the character of God determines very largely our attitude to history.

As to the first criterion, we can readily admit that an incarnation, if it is to be of value for religion, must reveal the very heart of God. He cannot, without emptying incarnation faith of all meaning, be left behind, unmoved, immovable, in isolation from the world. Incarnation cannot be rightly regarded as merely a partial or insignificant manifestation of God's nature. An Indian writer says, 'Krishna's incarnation is a camouflage, but it is for the well-being of the world.' That he could be satisfied with such an idea, shows the difference between Hindu and Christian belief. But the latter cannot, and does not, find a sufficient basis for faith through any temporary manifestation or condescending caprice on the part of God. Even if, for the purpose of high ethical or religious edification, God gave what might be called dramatic representations of Himself, this would not be enough. The religious demand is for absolute sincerity, not play-acting. The needs of the world are too great to be conceivably treated with less than absolute seriousness by the Redeemer-God. If the motive for Incarnation is redemption, we must regard this motive as deriving its character from the very essence of God. We must recall the fundamental Christian idea of creation, that the Creator-God is a God of Love, whose love does not remain a mere sentimental compassion, but flows forth into the world which He has made. The Incarnation which meets our religious needs must be the revelation of a God who is indeed infinite in knowledge and perfection, but who, when that knowledge includes an awareness of the suffering and evil of men, does not rest tranquilly, as the Aristotelian God might do, in the knowledge of these aspects of human experience, waiting for the ultimate approach of humanity towards Himself, but, just because of His fundamental nature, enters into the history of mankind and deals with its tragedy. The conception is crystallized in the central text of Christianity which tells us that God gave His Son—a part of Himself—'gave his only begotten Son'—His most precious possession. As Brunner says (*op. cit.*, 77), 'The God who reveals His love to us in Jesus Christ, and in it His holy, inviolable and sovereign will, in so doing really shows us Himself, not merely something of Himself, not merely an apparent form of His existence.'

As to the second criterion—the degree of reality ascribed to the historical conditions—it is obvious that wherever a philosophy is prevalent which regards human experience in general as of the nature of a dream, an incarnation cannot be more than a dramatic representation, indefinitely repeatable; and this we have already seen to be unsatisfying. Now a philosophy of this negating

type is prevalent in India, and yet belief in incarnational manifestations is also widespread. We can explain this apparent contradiction partly by referring to the readiness of the Indian mind to entertain at one and the same time detached compartmental beliefs, and we may also point out that multiplicity of incarnations is itself an indication that history has not been taken with full seriousness. An act which is regarded as of cosmic seriousness is *not* repeated over and over again. Hinduism makes abundant use of the category of myth, and prides itself upon the fact that alone amongst the religions it is not hampered by what Vivekananda calls 'historicality.' But it purchases this freedom at a great price—at the cost of a fully valuable belief in Incarnation. As Brunner says, 'The myth does not take seriously the heavenly-earthly, the divine-human happenings, or it takes them seriously in a relative sense only, as incidents within a process which finally returns to the starting point' (p. 447). It is only in relation to an historical person that we can get rid of subjectivity, and it is only when historical conditions are not depreciated that we can reach an adequately-based belief in Incarnation, one that delivers us from the bondage of subjectivity and thus becomes valuable for the salvation of our souls.

Conversely, such a belief in Incarnation strengthens our belief in the significance of history, and sublimates it to the level at which we can view the whole of our experience as in a sense sacramental. More particularly, the Christian view of Incarnation leads to that type of belief in the sacramental generally which can be a basis for a reliance upon the value of the specific sacraments of our faith. For, in the words of Professor Grensted (*The Person of Christ*, 73), 'In sacrament eternity touches time. The *Is* breaks through upon the *Now*. God reaches out to man, significantly and effectively. . . . The *present* is the sphere of action of that which lies beyond, that which is not *held* by time, but for which time itself has meaning.'

What is God doing about this World's Sin?

By the Reverend Professor Norman V. Hope, B.D., New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Jersey, U.S.A.

This question of what God is doing in face of this world's sin is one that must always have puzzled thinking men and women in every age and generation. But seldom can it have been more acute than to-day, when the sin of man is written in such crimson colours across the face of the world. In many places, decent, peaceful, godly men and groups have been set upon, robbed, persecuted, and even killed by ruthless brutal pagan aggressors, who fear not God, neither regard man. And the problem is this: What is God doing about it all? What is He doing to vindicate justice, righteousness, and truth against their powerful and cynical foes?

There are some who assert that God is doing nothing at all. And it must be admitted that there is this *apparent* justification for such an attitude, namely, that God is doing nothing spectacular, dramatic, so to speak miraculous. He doesn't send thunderbolts to strike dead the leading aggressors. He doesn't decimate invading armies by plague. He doesn't—to take a concrete case—divide the waters in China so as to allow the Chinese armies to cross in safety, and then draw those waters together again in order to drown the invading Japanese hordes.

But a little thought will enable us to understand why God will not intervene in such ways. For He has placed mankind in a world of law and order, and has given to all human beings freedom of will. These are the twin pillars on which alone any worthy human life and civilization can be built up. For God to intervene miraculously, even to vindicate righteousness, would mean that He would have to destroy one or other or both of these pillars. But this He will not do. For if He were to abrogate the rule of law, this world would become a chaos and not a cosmos. And, as J. S. Whale says, 'If our environment were a chaos rather than a relatively settled order . . . water might suddenly freeze in midsummer, the specific gravity of lead might at any time become that of thistledown, pigs might fly, and the Houses of Parliament might

turn into green cheese, and man's life would be a nightmare, not only because it would be unpleasant, but because it would have no moral meaning.' Nor will God break His image in man by depriving man of his freedom of will; for what He wishes from mankind is—to quote the title of one of Bertrand Russell's essays—'A Free Man's Worship,' the uncoerced response of a free spirit, and not the mechanical reactions of a robot or puppet. Being God, He can be satisfied with nothing less.

But though God is thus doing nothing spectacular or miraculous, it would be quite wrong to conclude that therefore He is doing nothing at all in face of this world's sin. For to Christian faith God is no mere passive spectator of human life; and when men set themselves to work all manner of unrighteousness, it is with Him, the Judge of all the earth, that they have to make their reckoning. What then is He doing about the world's sin?

The answer to this question will best be found by considering the Cross of Jesus Christ. Surely this was the world's greatest sin. Surely Calvary was the place, and the Cross the event, in which human evil did its very worst, by putting the Son of God to a shameful and horrible death. What did God do about the sin that nailed His Son to the Cross?

To begin with, He judged that sin. This doesn't mean that He singled out the various men and groups who were immediately responsible for Jesus' death, and dealt out punishments to them according to their several complicities. What it means is that that same sin of rebelliousness and opposition which led the Jews to reject and finally to crucify Jesus, inevitably brought about its own punishment. For within a generation of Jesus' death the Jews revolted against the Roman authority in Palestine. This rebellion was brutally crushed: and in A.D. 70 Titus, the Roman general, destroyed Jerusalem and razed the Temple, the centre and focus of Hebrew religion, to the ground. Not long thereafter the Jews were expelled from their native land, to become homeless and often persecuted wanderers over the face of the earth. It was doubtless this impending judgment that Jesus had in mind when He wept over Jerusalem.

Not merely did God judge the sin that crucified His Son, but He bore it as well. Of course, it was Jesus who was arrested by the Temple police, tried before Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin, sentenced by Pilate, and crucified. But God was in Christ, all through His earthly pilgrimage, and never more so than during that week which culminated in the Cross, or rather in the Resurrection. What human sin did to Jesus, it did to God.

In an Italian church there is a picture of unwonted insight. At first glance it is only another picture of the Crucifixion. But a second glance shows it to be different; for there can be seen a vast and shadowy Figure behind the figure of Jesus. The nail that pierces the hand of Jesus goes through to the hand of God; the spear thrust into His side is thrust also into God's side. This picture graphically portrays the truth that God bore the sin which crucified His Son.

Again, God used the sin which crucified Jesus to accomplish His own beneficent and redemptive ends. This was not, of course, what Christ's crucifiers had intended or wanted: they had thought and hoped that when the grave closed over Him, He would be done for and done with. But God thwarted their purposes by bringing victory to His cause out of apparent defeat, and good out of evil. For by Christ's Cross He accomplished the salvation of mankind. Says Paul: 'We preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling-block, and unto Gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called, the power of God, and the wisdom of God' (1 Co $1^{23, 24}$). God used the Cross, where human sin did its worst, to bring about His high and holy ends for mankind. He made even the wrath of man to praise Him.

Now the answer to the question, What is God doing about this world's sin?, is this, that He stands to it in exactly the same relation as He stood to the sin which nailed Jesus to the Cross.

I. He judges it. This means that the sins which are being committed by aggressor powers are steadily rotting their soul; that those powers, because of their hostility to God and goodness, are steadily becoming blind to moral and spiritual values. And since history goes to prove that, at bottom, greatness and endurance depend in the long run on responsiveness to such moral and spiritual factors, these aggressor groups are marked down for eventual decline and even ruin. An illustration will perhaps make this point clearer. In 1937 the late Lord Tweedsmuir published a biography of Augustus Cæsar, the founder of the Roman Empire. This Empire undoubtedly looked most imposing; but it was based on the suppression of freedom and the worship of the State as embodied in the Emperor. As a reviewer said: 'The reader will not miss the moral of the Imperial story. Dictatorship made the Roman Empire powerful. The price was slavery; the end was ruin.' This ruin didn't happen all at once: it took about five centuries; it came slowly but surely. And it is as true to-day as ever that:

Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind
exceeding small;
Though with patience He stands waiting, with exact-
ness grinds He all.

God judges human sin.

II. He also bears it. The Cross has revealed once and for all the truth that God in Jesus is for ever bearing human sin.

I sometimes think about the Cross,
And shut my eyes, and try to see
The cruel nails and crown of thorns
And Jesus, crucified for me.

But even could I see Him die,
I could but see one little part
Of that great love which, like a fire,
Is always burning in His heart.

This truth that God bears human sin, so that every wrong done to man is *ipso facto* done to God, has been expressed very well in Browning's poem, 'The Lost Leader,' which is supposed to deal with the alleged defection of the poet William Wordsworth, who, after starting out by hailing the French Revolution with its ideas of liberty, equality, and fraternity, ended up by becoming a dyed-in-the-wool reactionary. Says Browning:

Blot out his name, then, record one lost soul more,
One task more declined, one more footpath untrod,
One more devils'-triumph and sorrow for angels,
One wrong more to man, one more insult to God!

God in Jesus is always bearing human sin. So when the question is asked, Why does God allow such terrible things to happen?, the further question remains: Why does He allow them to happen—to Himself?

III. God uses human sin to bring about His high purposes. For example, in the early Christian Church at Jerusalem, none was more persuasive and successful as an apologist than Stephen. So effective was he that he was brought before the Jewish Sanhedrin, accused of blasphemy, and illegally stoned to death. It looked as if the death of Stephen might bring the missionary activity of the early Church to an abrupt stop. But did it? There was standing by at the death of Stephen a young Pharisee named Saul. The whole circumstances of Stephen's death made Saul wonder as to whether he (Saul) was on the right track in religion. This conflict reached its climax only when Saul surrendered to Jesus Christ, and became an even greater Christian evangelist and apologist than the martyred Stephen had been. God used the killing of Stephen—terrible sin though it was—for His greater glory and for the accomplishment of His redemptive purposes for mankind.

This is everlastingly true—as true to-day as in New Testament times. Take one obvious example. In Germany, ever since Hitler came into power in 1933, the Christian Church has been persecuted for its refusal to nazify its religion, and put Jesus Christ into a brown shirt. This persecution has been carried out with calculated terrorism by men who are acting as agents of the devil. But God has used even it for His own holy ends. For this persecution has made the profession of the Christian faith a live issue; it has separated real followers of Jesus from camp-followers; it has aroused the prayerful interest of Christians all over the world. So deep has been its influence that Emil Brunner is reported to have said that 'Hitler has done more for religion than any other man in Europe.' Even here God has made the wrath of man to praise Him.

The message for us is twofold. First, a message of trust. We can trust God to work out His purposes as year succeeds to year, in spite of all man's sin and wickedness. Tennyson expressed this well when he wrote:

And all is well, tho' faith and form
Be sundered in a night of fear;
Well roars the storm to those that hear
A deeper voice across the storm,

Proclaiming social truth shall spread,
And justice, ev'n tho' thrice again
The red fool-fury of the Seine
Shall pile her barricades with dead.

And then a message of challenge. God in Jesus challenges each one of us to co-operate with Him, to act as His servants and agents in bringing about His redemptive purposes in human life and society Have we enlisted in His service?

Contributions and Comments.

The Interpretation of El Gibbor in Isaiah ix. 5 (EVV, 6).

The exegesis of the second half of this verse has always occasioned difficulty. Do all the last eight words in the Hebrew refer to the promised infant prince? This was the opinion of Ibn Ezra, and it is followed by the English Versions. The true text of the Septuagint presupposes a different text, but some codd. (א A Q Γ) have apparently been influenced by the Massoretic Text, and these agree with the English Versions, as also do Lucian and the Vulgate. In this case, is it better to translate 'mighty warrior,' or some such equivalent? The alternative is to make the phrase refer to God Himself, and not to a human prince at all. This is the Jewish tradition, represented by the Targum, Rashi, Kimhi, and Jewish commentators generally. Luzatto saw no reference whatever to the child, and translated 'God the Almighty, the eternal Father, the Prince of Peace, resolves upon wonderful things.' The normal Jewish tradition makes 'Prince of Peace' refer to the child, and all the other epithets to God Himself. Certainly it is in accordance with the usage of the phrase El (Adonai) Gibbor elsewhere to make it refer to God. See Ps 24^{8} twice, Dt 10^{17}, Jer 32^{18}, Neh 9^{32}, and especially Is 10^{21}, which is by the same prophet as the verse here under discussion. In all these cases the phrase is used of God as the Saviour of, or the Conqueror for His people. This is the sense of the phrase here also, of whomsoever it may be used.

The accentuation of the verse has occasioned equal difficulty. Delitzsch[1] discussed this aspect of the problem at great length, and added a long note. He pointed out that the accentuators seem to have shrunk from taking El Gibbor as the name of a man. He showed that there are difficulties from the point of view of the accentuation in taking the name of the child to be 'everlasting Father, Prince of Peace' and all the previous names, even including 'everlasting Father,' as referring to God. In the note, however, he admits that the ordinary exegesis, which he adopts in common with the English Versions, and which takes all eight names as referring to the young prince, does not correspond to the accentuation. Actually both solutions fall at the same obstacle. In each case there ought to be zaqeph qaton on the word שמו.

[1] *Commentary on Isaiah* (Eng. Tr.), i. 249 f.

The whole problem is centred on the curious accent of פלא. It is telisha gadol, and it ought not to be. Delitzsch contented himself with remarking that telisha gadol is the smallest of all the disjunctive accents. This, however, is not the point. There is a difficulty in the occurrence of this particular accent in this particular case. What is telisha gadol doing in pashta's clause next before pashta?

First of all we must deal with the RV margin 'Wonderful counsellor.' This is definitely wrong, since in that case the accent would be mehuppach, the servus of pashta, making פלא (mehuppach) as dependent on יועץ (pashta) as אל (munach) is on גבור (zaqeph qaton). The accent mehuppach is actually found in six of the Ginsburg codd., none of which is particularly reliable when it varies from the traditional accentuation.

Secondly, the usual translation 'Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God' is moderately satisfactory, except for the zaqeph qaton which ought to be found earlier in the verse, and for the strange telisha gadol.

The difficulty of this telisha gadol is that it marks the main break in pashta's clause when that break is on the *second*, and not the *first*, word from pashta. In such a case the intermediate word has geresh. Three of the Ginsburg codd., Add. 4708, Add. 15252, and G 3, have realized this, and so have added Gershaim also, making two accents on the same word, telisha gadol and geresh. This is against the Massorah at Gn 5^{29}, which says that there are five cases where these two accents are found, Gn 5^{29}, Lv 10^{4}, 2 K 17^{13}, Ezk 48^{10}, Zeph 2^{15}.

Two codd., namely Add. 15251 (always sound even when it varies from the normal accentuation) and Add. 14760 (which occasionally joins with Add. 15251 to make a second where accents are concerned—cf. 5^{27}), have the accent rebhia. This reading is followed by the first three complete printed Bibles, Soncino 1488, Naples 1491–3, and Brescia 1494. It is sound enough so far as the rules of accentuation are concerned, but it alters the whole balance of the half-verse, for it makes the main break in zaqeph qaton's clause (which ends at Gibbor) to be at פלא, and not at יועץ (pashta). This is not what was intended by the Massoretic accentuators. They intended the main division of the half-verse to be at גבור (hence zaqeph qaton in silluq's clause), and the main division of zaqeph's clause to be at יועץ (pashta). The accent rebhia gives no

pashta-clause at all, but makes pashta and munach the two servi to zaqeph qaton, and makes all previous words in the clause, including 'and his name shall be called,' to be included in rebhia's clause.

The accentuators evidently intended to make a break at פלא, and did not quite know how to do it. Mehuppach meant no break at all, whilst rebhia made too violent a break and disturbed the whole sentence. But why did they not do what Delitzsch wanted them to do, that is, accent the first two words ויקרא שמו with munach zaqeph qaton? This gives the usual translation 'And his name shall be called . . .', thus cutting the first two words off from the rest. The truth is that they did not want this either. They wanted to bring other words in the half-verse into connexion with the first two. The first of these words they marked off from the rest by giving the word פלא the accent telisha gadol. This, whilst not strictly correct, did at any rate make a break in the verse, since there ought to be another word intervening, and another accent, namely, geresh. There is also a definite break in the latter part of the half-verse. There was no real need to join the last four words of the verse into two pairs with maqqehs, and then to separate the two pairs with tiphkha. They could have joined them into two pairs, as they have done with maqqephs, and then yoked the pairs together with merkha. But they separated them. We therefore separate El Gibbor and Father Everlasting from the other epithets, as the accents suggest, and make them the two subjects of the sentence, as also the accents suggest, since they do not cut the first two words off from the rest of the half-verse, as is usual. We then translate:

> And the Mighty God hath called his name Wonder, Counsellor,
> The Everlasting Father (hath called his name) Prince of Peace.

There is no need for the two phrases to have the article in order that they should be subjects of the sentence, as Delitzsch suggested (*ib.*, 250), since in Is 10^{21} El Gibbor, without the article, is quite clearly a personal name for God, as also is Adonai Gibbor in Ps 24^{8}.

This suggested translation is truer to the general exegesis, not only of the phrase El Gibbor, but also of the phrase 'Father Everlasting.' Further, we have now a parallelism in the half-verse, thus bringing it into line with its neighbour.

It may also be pointed out that studies in the accents should not be limited only to the orthodox accentuation, but that a new, and possibly profitable line of study is opened up by examining, as we have done in this article, exactly what the various scribes have done when they have been confronted with a text for which the regular rules of accentuation do not exactly provide.

NORMAN H. SNAITH.

Headingley College, Leeds.

What seekest Thou? John iv. 27.

WHAT is the point of the disciples' desire to ask τί ζητεῖς?

(1) Westcott says, 'A double question arose. . . . Could their Master require a service from a woman? or could He wish to commune with her as a teacher?' It may be that, the waterpot still standing between them, there was enough evidence to make them guess that He had begged a drink. The suppressed question of the disciples is then the same as that already asked by the woman herself in *v.*[9]. 'What do you want?' implies 'You cannot want anything of a woman and a Samaritan.'

(2) Another possibility is that ζητεῖν may refer to judicial inquiry or to philosophical quest. A few words of the Lord had probed deep into the woman's past. This unwelcome *investigation* she had sought to interrupt; an impersonal *discussion* of the questions over which Jew and Samaritan habitually wrangled was more to her taste. Something of this may have been apparent in the defensive attitude of the woman as the disciples approached. Hence the desire to ask, 'What are you investigating?' or 'What are you discussing?'

(3) But it seems to me most likely that if the questions had been spoken, the first, τί ζητεῖς, would have been directed, not to our Lord but to the woman: 'What are you wanting?' And then, having disposed of her, they would have asked, 'Why talk to her?' Both questions spring from the same source, not mere curiosity as to what has happened in their absence, but desire to remedy a situation which their presence would have been able to prevent. When women 'brought their babes that he should touch them' (Lk 18^{15}) the disciples acted upon similar impulse, and almost did prevent them. They rebuked the women first, before turning to the Lord. 'What are you wanting?' It is the question which meets the intruder, which overtakes the trespasser, which shames the

presumptuous. The purpose of asking it is to produce, not an answer, but an exit.

And then they find that the presumption has been theirs.

JOHN FOSTER.

Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

2 Thessalonians ii. 4.

THERE is a phrase in the description of the 'man of sin' which has produced a remarkable variety of translations. He is described as 'he that opposeth and exalteth himself' ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα.

Most of the authentic versions are slightly inaccurate in their rendering of πάντα, which is treated as though it were neuter. The Vulgate has 'supra omne quod dicitur Deus aut quod colitur'; Luther translates, 'über alles, was Gott oder Gottesdienst heisst'; the English A.V. and R.V. say, 'against (A.V. above) all that is called God, or that is worshipped.' Luther differs from the others in taking σέβασμα as governed by λεγόμενον instead of by ἐπὶ. But they agree in regarding πάντα as neuter, in spite of the fact that a neuter plural is not grammatically possible here, and that there is no manuscript attestation for the neuter singular πᾶν.

What is the explanation of this refusal to take πάντα as masculine? It may be, as Professor John Griffiths, of Cardiff, suggests to me, that there was a doctrinal prejudice against a literal version, which might have been considered to involve a concession to polytheism, in the suggestion that there are other personal gods apart from God. It is admitted, however, that these words, which may refer to Caligula, are probably reminiscent of Dn 11^{36}, where the reference is to Antiochus Epiphanes: 'and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself against every god.' Here the Septuagint has ἐπὶ πάντα θεὸν, and the versions mentioned have not shrunk from a literal translation. Perhaps the explanation lies rather in a grammatical misunderstanding. A kind of attraction seems to have operated in the mind of the translators, proceeding from the neuter meaning of σέβασμα and causing Θεόν and σέβασμα to be taken loosely in apposition to a neuter plural πάντα.

Some modern versions have corrected this error, but they differ in other respects. Moffatt would give to λεγόμενον a meaning which it has occasionally in classical literature (see Liddell-Scott-Jones, *s.v.*), and this involves taking πάντα adjectivally: 'against every so-called god or object of worship.' A serious exegetical objection can be raised to this version: the contemptuous 'so-called' is not feasible here, since the 'man of sin' is clearly thought to be exalting himself against God as well as against gods.

Milligan translates in his *Commentary* (p. 99) 'against every one called god or object of worship.' The apparent assumption that σέβασμα is governed by λεγόμενον cannot be demonstrated to be wrong. But σέβασμα, unlike Θεός, is not an appellation of a person worshipped. It must refer to an object, as distinct from a person, worshipped, and must therefore be governed by ἐπὶ. According to this construction, the word for 'every' will be understood as repeated before σέβασμα.

The following is therefore put forward as a possible translation: 'against every person who is called god or (every) thing which is worshipped.'

J. GWYN GRIFFITHS.

Pentre, Rhondda.

Theology and Seismology.

IN his article on this subject in the April number, Rev. F. H. Durnford suggests that a study of seismology should strengthen rather than weaken our faith in a 'Faithful Creator.' As one of many ministers who must have felt a compulsion to preach on this subject by the recent earthquake in Turkey, I should like to submit a line of thought which bears out his suggestion.

A very elementary knowledge of seismology seems to indicate that the physical cause of these disasters is to be found in the fact that this earth of ours has reached a kind of half-way stage in its evolution, the hard outer crust containing within, a still molten mass. It appears further that ONLY a planet in this half-way stage is capable of supporting the kind of life we know and enjoy on this earth. At an earlier stage of development it would be too hot and at a later stage, too cold to support life.

The suffering and distress which follows an earthquake would seem, therefore, to be part of the price we pay for the privilege of living here on earth. It is, in this respect, like so much of the suffering which arises in other ways. When we suffer as the result of sin we are paying the price of living in a morally ordered universe. When we suffer because of the sin of others, we are paying the price of living in a world where human fellowship is possible. When we suffer through our mistakes of ignorance, we are

really paying the price of growth. And, in all these instances, the good thing we secure is surely well worth the price we have to pay.

Since, too, we know from the Christian revelation that God is not outside all this suffering, but suffers with us and for us, we may say that the suffering borne by the Eternal Love through all the ages is the price which God pays for being Himself; for being that Perfect Love which could do no other than create the best possible kind of world; could do no other than create men and women in His own image, with that freedom of the will, the wrong use of which results in sin and pain. We thus have a theological basis for our assertion that the good things secured at the price of pain are worth their price; for God Himself thought it worth endless pain to make the world as He did.

The point which has been made about this earth being in an intermediate stage of development also leads back to another fundamental element in Christian teaching. For while this planet may support life for many centuries yet to come, it would appear to be no more of a permanent home for the race than for the individual. Lovely as it is, this earth is but one of the many mansions in the Father's house. A right adjustment then to our environment must include a recognition of this impermanence. Paradox as it may sound, a man can only be really at home in this earth when he realizes that it is not his real home, and confesses, as all true citizens of the city of God have done, that he is a stranger and pilgrim on the earth.

Man's greatest mistake has been made just here. He has thought this world was all, and has planned his life as though he were here for ever. He has sought his treasures amongst things which are perishable, which moth and rust corrupt and into which thieves break through and steal.

Hence all his fears, his antagonisms, his rivalries, and his wars. Small wonder, then, that an earthquake so disturbs him, for it shakes the very foundations of those things in which he trusts. It may be necessary in the providence of God for that faith to be shaken, in order that man may see what the real foundations of life are, turn his heart to seek imperishable treasures and place his confidence where it cannot be shaken, in the eternal nature of God.

If an earthquake should do this for just a few, then we get at least a glimpse of one way in which, as the previous writer says, earthquakes may fulfil the purposes of the Creator.

LEONARD G. OAKEY.

Rawdon.

Entre Nous.

An Intercession.

'O Thou Source of all true consolation, who when Thou risest to save all the meek of the earth wilt turn the wrath of man to Thy praise, bring out of Thine abundant mercy blessing and hope for those who suffer from the ravages of war. Lay Thy hand gently upon those who have lost loved ones. Succour the wounded and the dying; fill their hearts with the remembrance of Thy faithful word and the rich promises of Thy grace. Grant courage and good cheer to those who go in peril of their lives. Take into the secret of Thy presence all who spend their days in ceaseless anxiety and constant apprehension of sad tidings. Have mercy upon those who have lost their reason or their sight. Take to Thy loving care the little children who are rendered fatherless. Grant new resource to those whose livelihoods have been reduced or lost; provide for those who have been rendered homeless. Let no disaster shake our confidence in Christ. Save us from bitterness of spirit; from self-pity and vindictiveness, and keep burning in our hearts a love for all men through Jesus Christ our Lord.'[1]

A Creed.

'We believe that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners of whom we are chief; that where two or three are gathered in His name there He is in the midst; that God is love, and that he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him; that the things which are impossible with man are possible with God; that a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth; that it is more blessed to give than to receive; that we ought to obey God rather than men; that all things work together for good to them that love God; that nothing can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.'[2]

[1] *Prayers of World Fellowship.*

[2] *Ibid.*

The Faith.

In his last book, *Memory Hold-the-Door,* John Buchan wrote: 'To-day the quality of our religion is being put to the test. The conflict is not only between the graces of civilization and the rawness of barbarism. More is being challenged than the system of ethics which we believe to be the basis of our laws and liberties. I am of Blake's view: "*Man must and will have some religion; if he has not the religion of Jesus he will have the religion of Satan, and will erect a synagogue of Satan.*"

'There have been high civilizations in the past which have not been Christian, but in the world as we know it I believe that civilization must have a Christian basis, and must ultimately rest on the Christian Church. To-day the Faith is being attacked, and the attack is succeeding.

'Thirty years ago Europe was nominally a Christian continent. It is no longer so. In Europe, as in the era before Constantine, Christianity is in a minority. What Gladstone wrote seventy years ago, in a moment of depression, has become a shattering truth: "*I am convinced that the welfare of mankind does not now depend on the State and the world of politics; the real battle is being fought in the world of thought, where a deadly attack is made with great tenacity of purpose and over a wide field upon the greatest treasure of mankind, the belief in God and the Gospel of Christ.*"

'The Christian in name has in recent years been growing cold in his devotion. Our achievement in perfecting life's material apparatus has produced a mood of self-confidence and pride. Our peril has been indifference, and that is a grave peril, for rust will crumble a metal when hammer blows will only harden it. I believe—and this is my crowning optimism—that the challenge with which we are now faced may restore to us that manly humility which alone gives power. It may bring us back to God. In that case our victory is assured. The Faith is an anvil which has worn out many hammers.

'We are condemned to fumble in these times, for the mist is too thick to see far down the road. But in all our uncertainty we can have Cromwell's hope. "*To be a Seeker is to be of the best sect next to a Finder, and such an one shall every faithful, humble Seeker be at the end.*" So as a tail-piece to this book I would transcribe a sentence of Henry Adams: "*After all, man knows mighty little, and may some day learn enough of his own ignorance to fall down and pray.*" Dogmatism gives place to questioning, and questioning to prayer.'

Conscience.

'Preachers habitually speak well of conscience. They even call it the voice of God in the soul of man. . . . Yet one of the most difficult tasks in human life is to make conscience behave itself.

'As we face this problem, let us remember from the first the Christian witness. In checking conscience, nothing has helped some of us so much as the personality of the Master Himself. To carry our problems of right and wrong into His presence and try to see them as He would look at them is a swift, rough and ready, practical, efficient way of checking conscience. One of the finest testimonies I ever heard to any man's character was given by a New York layman to his minister when he said: "He has been our animated conscience." If Christ is not that to us, then our discipleship is a lame affair.'[1]

Sunday Labour.

'It is no doubt wholesome for body and mind to have one day's rest in seven; and, quite apart from religion, the cessation of most kinds of work on Sunday is a thoroughly good thing. But you do not keep a day holy by being idle on it. Moreover, it was precisely this superstitious attitude to the Sabbath which led the Scribes and Pharisees to attack our Lord, who held that "it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath day."

'Normally it is good, and therefore our duty, to keep Sunday partly for worship and partly for rest. The obligation of worship always remains, and those who work hardest can always find time for it.

'The good of rest is that when refreshed by it we may work better. But when our duty to God and man demands that for a period we should go without the weekly rest, there ought not to be any hesitation on religious grounds. Such a claim is made on many folk to-day.

'They should have no qualms of conscience. Let them join in the worship of God at the time of day when their work allows, and let them work in the spirit of those who give to God all that He asks of them. "Pray and work" should be their rule.'[2]

[1] H. E. Fosdick, in *The Christian World,* July 18, 1940.

[2] The Archbishop of York, in the *York Diocesan Leaflet.*

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.